Hadiyyat al-Shīʿah

(A gift for the Shīʿah)

Part 1

Ḥujjat al-Islam

Moulānā Muḥammad Qāsim Nānotwī

WWW.MAHAJJAH.COM

Contents

بِسۡمِ ٱللَّهِ ٱلرَّحۡمَٰنِ ٱلرَّحِيمِ

Ḥujjat al-Islam Moulānā Muḥammad Qāsim Nānotwī

One of the most esteemed personalities in the History of Islam

By Muftī Saʿīd Aḥmad Pālanpūrī

Name and lineage

His name was Muḥammad Qāsim. His historic name was Khurshīd Ḥusayn. His father's name was Asʿad ʿAlī and his grandfather's name was Shaykh Ghulām Shāh. His entire lineage is as follows:

> Muḥammad Qāsim, who was the son of Asʿad ʿAlī, who was the son of Ghulām Shāh, who was the son of Muḥammad Bakhsh, who was the son of ʿAlā' al-Dīn, who was the son of Muḥammad Fattāḥ, who was the son of Muḥammad Muftī, who was the son of ʿAbd al-Samīʿ, who was the son of Moulānā Muḥammad Hāshim.

His lineage links up to Qāsim bin Muḥammad bin Abī Bakr رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ.

Birth and demise

He was born in 1248 A.H (1832) in the town of Nānotah. He passed away on Thursday 4 Jamādal Ūlā 1297 A.H (1879) after Ẓuhr ṣalāh. To Allah do we belong and unto Him shall we return.

Hometown

His hometown was Nānotah, which is a marginally populated town. It is situated twelve miles east of Deoband, fifteen miles south of Sahāranpūr, nine miles west of Ghanghoh and seven miles north of Delhi.

His ancestral grandfather- Moulānā Muḥammad Hāshim رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّهُ, was very close to the Mughal Emperor Shāh Jaḥān. Moulānā Muḥammad Ḥāshim رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّهُ settled in

Nānotah and in so doing transformed it into an Islamic town.It was in this town that his progeny flourished and it was from this very town that the radiant star- Moulānā Muḥammad Qāsim Nānotwī رحمه الله, shone forth.

Childhood

During his childhood, he saw a dream that he was sitting in the lap of Allah Taʿālā, which his grandfather interpreted to mean that Allah Taʿālā will grant him abundant knowledge and he will become a well-known personality. His intelligence, prowess, courage, quick thinking, broad mindedness and diligence stood out from his childhood days and he always took first position in his class. He had an affinity for poetry from an early age and would write his stories and games in rhyming form.

Education

His primary education began in the Madrassah of Nānotah. He then studied Arabic under Moulānā Muḥtāb ʿAlī رحمه الله in Deoband. Impressed by Moulānā's wisdom and deep insight, Moulānā Muḥtāb ʿAlī رحمه الله gave him the title of "ʿilm kī Bakri" (goat of knowledge), a reflection of his constant pursuit of knowledge. He then studied for a short while under Moulānā Muḥammad Nawāz in Sahāranpūr. He then went to Delhi in the company of Moulānā Mamlūk ʿAlī رحمه الله in 1259 A.H, where he began studying *Kāfiyyah* (an intricate book on Arabic grammar) and completed his studies in five years. He studied ḥadīth under Moulānā Shāh ʿAbd al-Ghanī Mujadidī[1] رحمه الله. After arriving in Delhi, he began excelling at such a rapid pace that none could keep up with him; he could read intricate books of philosophy just as a ḥāfiẓ can recite a portion of the Qur'ān.

1 Moulānā Shah ʿAbd al-Ghanī Mujadidī, was the son of Abū Saʿīd, who was the son of ʿAzīz al-Qadr, who was the son of Safiyy al-Qadr, who was the son of Muḥammad ʿĪsā, who was the son of Sayf al-Dīn, who was the son of Muḥammad Maʿsūm, who was the son of Aḥmad (Mujadid Alf-e Thānī). He is the author of *Inhāj al-Ḥājah fi Hāl Sunan ibn Mājah*. He was born in Delhi (1235 A.H) and passed away in Madīnah (1296 A.H).

While residing in Delhi, he also sought spiritual reform from Moulānā Ḥājī Imdād Allāh al-Thānwī al-Makkī رحمه الله and began his efforts of self-purification.

Personality and character

Allah Taʿālā had made Moulānā an awe-inspiring personality because of which many people lacked the courage to address him, even though he was a light-hearted person with exceptional character. He preferred to be alone and from an early age and would prefer remaining silent. This is another reason why people would think twice before engaging in a conversation with him. He was extremely generous and a big-hearted, who took pleasure in entertaining guests and acts of hospitality. His wife was the same as him and even more so, such that she was the one who inspired his generosity. He would say: "My generosity is the result of Aḥmad's mother (i.e. his wife)."

Dislike for status

His condition for many years was such that if any person addressed him as "Molwī" then he would not reply, but if he was addressed by his name then he would be pleased. He disliked being praised and was uncomfortable with it. He was informal with everyone and kept a relationship more of friendship than as a teacher with his students. He disliked being referred to as 'Moulānā' and would say: "This title has spoilt everything, if there had not been a necessity, I would have remained hidden, such that no one would have known of my existence."

Glad tidings

During his days as a student, he saw a dream that he was standing on the Kaʿbah and thousands of rivers were flowing from it. His teacher, Moulānā Mamlūk ʿAlī رحمه الله interpreted this to mean: "Knowledge will spread from you abundantly."

On one occasion, his mother complained to Moulānā Ḥājī Imdād Allāh رحمه الله about his unemployment and lack of income, on which Ḥājī Imdād Allāh رحمه الله laughed and said:

> This man is about to become such that he will have hundreds of attendants. He will attain such fame that his name will be known across the world. You complain of poverty when Allah Taʿālā is going to grant him a thousand fold more, such that he will be better than those who are employed.

His mother lived to see this prediction come true.

Ḥājī Imdād Allāh رحمه الله also said about him:

> People of his calibre used to be found in the early years of Islam, now for years to come, we will not see another.

Life history

After completing his studies, he took on the responsibility of editing at the Aḥmadī publications company in Delhi. During this time, Moulānā Aḥmad ʿAlī Sahāranpūrī (who added the footnotes to *Ṣaḥīh al-Bukhārī*) tasked Moulānā with adding the footnotes to the last five or six chapters of *Ṣaḥīh al-Bukhārī*, which he fulfilled to perfection- each footnote taken from reliable books and nothing from his own opinion.

Later Jihād was declared against the British but due to difficulties faced at that time, the Muslims were not victorious. As soon as the British had gained complete control of the country, they issued a warrant for his arrest. He remained hidden for a few days and then departed for ḥajj and by the time he returned an official pardon had been announced.

After returning from ḥajj, he began acting as editor for Munshī Mumtāz ʿAlī in Mīrat, while at the same time teaching. It was during this time that the foundation for *Dār al-ʿUlūm Deoband* was laid. After a little while, he went to Deoband and saw to every aspect of the Madrassah. He taught all the books with no reservation and would render such a commentary that none had ever heard nor seen. He expounded amazing facts in each subject; reconciling differences of opinion and explaining each law in detail. The effects of his teachings remain to this day.

He performed his first ḥajj in 1277 A.H and during the journey, in the month of Ramaḍān, he memorised the entire Qur'ān and recited it in Tarāwīḥ ṣalāh. He performed his second ḥajj in 1285 A.H and the third in 1294 A.H and it was when returning from this ḥajj that his illness began, which proved to be fatal.

Children

He had two sons: Moulānā Muḥammad Aḥmad رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّٰهُ (former principal of Dār al-ʿUlūm Deoband) and Muḥammad Ḥāshim رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّٰهُ. He also had three daughters.

Students

He had numerous students but the most famous are:

1. Shaykh al-Hind Moulānā Maḥmūd Ḥasan Deobandī رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّٰهُ. He studied the majority of his books in Dār al-ʿUlūm Deoband and studied ḥadīth under Moulānā Qāsim Nānotwī رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّٰهُ. The first graduation ceremony of the Dār al-ʿUlūm was held for him.
2. Moulānā Fakhr al-Ḥasan Ghanghohī رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّٰهُ, who added the footnotes to *Abū Dāwūd*. His personality was exactly the same as Moulānā Ashraf ʿAlī al-Thānwī رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّٰهُ and was a very capable scholar too at that. He also acquired his knowledge from Dār al-ʿUlūm Deoband.
3. Moulānā Aḥmad Ḥasan Amrohawī رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّٰهُ. Moulānā Qāsim Nānotwī رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّٰهُ had great affection for him and he also loved Moulānā dearly. He was very intelligent and a proficient scholar.[1]

Aside from these three illustrious personalities, Moulānā رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّٰهُ had many more students, however the sacrifices and services of his other disciples and students have not been recorded, even though he treated them all equally.[2]

---

1 They are known as *Ḥasanayn-e Thalāthah,* i.e the three Ḥasans.

2 This was all taken from *Sawānikh-e Umarī* by Moulānā Muḥammad Yāqūb Nānotwī رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّٰهُ, who was among the first teachers of Dār al-ʿUlūm Deoband.

Accomplishments

The accomplishments for which he is most famous are three:

1. Establishing Madāris- more so Dār al-ʿUlūm Deoband.
2. Calling for Jihād against the British.
3. Services to Islamic knowledge.

We will now highlight his achievements in each of these fields.

Establishing Madāris

In 1274 A.H (1857) when the British had taken control of the entire country and the Mughal dynasty came to an end, Islam and Muslims became a target, and it was the Muslims who suffered the pain of the piercing claws of the British most. The reason for this is that the entire aspect of conqueror and conquered, usurper and usurped, victory and defeat, existed between the Muslims and the British. Those ʿulamā who were rendering services to dīn during the rule of the Mughal dynasty, did so either receiving a wage or assistance from the royal court and as such lived in relative ease. A few ʿulamā also rendered services in their own private capacity; teaching, tutoring and lecturing in their own localities. However after the British took over, there no longer remained any assistance from the government- wages or financial assistance. Poverty and impoverishment created an entirely new challenge and slowly the traces of the glory of Islam began to dwindle, as the ʿulamā now became occupied with their own livelihood. What was to happen to the future of Islam? This was a vital question.

However, Allah Taʿālā says in the Noble Qur'ān:

وَالَّذِيْنَ جَاهَدُوْا فِيْنَا لَنَهْدِيَنَّهُمْ سُبُلَنَا ۚ

> We shall definitely show our avenues (of guidance and insight) to those who exert themselves in Our cause.[1]

1 Sūrah al-ʿAnkabūt: 69

Allah Taʿālā inspired all the saints at the same time with the idea that the only way of protecting dīn and Islam is to now establish Madāris using public funds. This meant that those ʿulamā who until this point in time were rendering services to dīn in their own private capacity will now have to join together and work collectively. One of the benefits of this would be that the institute would see to their basic needs and as a result they would be able to serve dīn with no worry of having to earn a livelihood. Another benefit of this would be that if any ʿālim, out of necessity or for any other reason, were to abandon his responsibilities then another would take his place. The garden would continue being watered even if the gardener were to change. "Public funds" is general and not from a particular person- work would continue relying upon the funds of the general public. They would not depend upon the wealth or donations of the government, wealthy or those in authority; which would mean that the madrassah would suffer no harm if a select few refused to assist the madrassah; as the loss suffered on account of them would be borne by another. In addition, the general public who will assist the madrassah will not try to influence the madrassah in any way. If funds are taken from a particular individual then the life and death of the madrassah is dependent upon that very one person. Another harm of this is that true reliance in Allah will not be gained, as opposed to when a person has no one else to rely upon except Allah. The third most harmful aspect of relying upon the funds of a particular individual is that he will have the ability to influence madrassah policy and what is taught therein.

On account of this inspiration, ʿulamā began opening madāris across India but there still remained a few who did not understand this inspiration or the true reality of it. Thus, they continued their efforts of dīn on their own and just as a roof cannot stand without a pillar, their services too did not last very long and slowly they became preoccupied with earning a living and their services to dīn came to an end. A few of them did indeed build madāris but disliked asking from the general public and so remained dependent upon specific individuals or the government. As a result, these madāris either had to close due to lack of finance or inevitably became government institutions.

It is a great favour of Allah that not only did these ʿulamā understand the meaning of this inspiration but also understood its importance and true reality. It is without a doubt that Moulānā Qāsim Nānotwī رحمه الله understood its importance more than all and in fact wrote it out for us, which is preserved to this day. He wrote:

> The principles on which this madrassah (Dār al-ʿUlūm Deoband) and others like it will operate.

This makes it clear that these principles are not only stipulated for Dār al-ʿUlūm Deoband but for every madrassah relying on public funds. Let us examine numbers 6, 7, and 8 of these principles.

> 6) As long as this madrassah will not have any fixed income then, Allah willing , it will be run with attention turned towards Allah. If it will attain a fixed income, such as rental, trade or government grants then the attention will be turned away from Allah and reliance upon Allah will fade. In this way divine assistance will stop, infighting will begin and we will find ourselves becoming dependent.
>
> 7) Assistance from the government and influential people is harmful.
>
> 8) There is more blessing in the funds attained from the general public, who do not seek any favour in return. In essence it is the general public whose intentions are nobler.

These principles should be read over and over again and pondered over deeply, one will then see how true this inspiration was. Nevertheless, as a result of this inspiration the ʿulamā began to establish madāris based upon these principles and now almost a century later, we are forced to admit that if they had not done so then Islam would have faded into non-existence in India.

Moulānā Qāsim Nānotwī رحمه الله used his influence to establish the building of various madāris and in his short life managed to build four.

1. Dār al-ʿUlūm Deoband
2. Madrassah Qāsimiyyah Shāhī Murādabād
3. Madrassah Manba' al-ʿUlūm Galāwatī
4. Madrassah Jāmiʿ Masjid Amrohah

All of these Madāris were founded by Moulānā but it is the good fortune of Dār al-ʿUlūm Deoband that Moulānā became its supervisor and maintained it, as Deoband was his second hometown. All the illustrious personalities from Deoband such as Moulānā Ḥājī ʿĀbid Ḥusayn رحمه الله (first principal of Dār al-ʿUlūm Deoband), Moulānā Rafīʿ al-Dīn رحمه الله (second principal of Dār al-ʿUlūm Deoband), etc all had a close relationship with Moulānā Qāsim Nānotwī رحمه الله. After 1857, Deoband became his true home town, which had already been predestined, and he took up permanent residence in Deoband and saw to all the needs and requirements of the Dār al-ʿUlūm. The other madāris founded by Moulānā did not receive the same favour and as a result could not reach the same level as Dār al-ʿUlūm Deoband. Today this Madrassah has grown into a huge firm tree providing fruit to the entire world.

Calling for Jihād

In the latter half of the nineteenth century a time of difficulty began for all Muslims in India when it became a battleground for the British. The rule of the Mughal Empire ended and the Muslims were now faced with many threats, both internal and external. However Allah Taʿālā sent such individuals who fought these threats and succeeded in keeping the pillars of dīn standing. Moulānā Qāsim Nānotwī رحمه الله is the leader of this group of illustrious individuals. Just as he began the establishment of Madāris so too did he begin fighting all external and internal threats. When the British decided to take control of India by force of the sword, Moulānā fought them back at Shāmilī. When the British began attacking all religions in India, specifically the dīn of Islam, it was Moulānā who combated

them, earning the gratitude of not only the Muslims but the Hindus as well. In the fair of Chāndāpūr (in the district of Shāh Jahānpūr) the Hindus were singing his praises. They too acknowledged Moulānā's intelligence, prowess, and ability to debate, and would flock to gather around him from afar, as the threats posed by the British affected all Indians.

The British then changed their game plan and tried to attack the Muslims from the rear, preparing a small group of Hindus to oppose the Muslims and Islam. Moulānā fought back this threat head on as well.

The British then adopted a new plan, establishing schools appearing to teach Islam but in actual fact were enforcing British teaching. This was a cunning plan and a well placed web, but Moulānā saw its true nature and saved the Muslims from its snares.

The British then thought of another plan and created a small group from among the Muslims to oppose the majority. Moulānā thwarted their plans in this as well. In essence, Moulānā fought whatever plot the British could devise, setting the standard for all future ʿulamā that it is compulsory upon them to fight against all forms of mischief and threats to Islam.

Services to Islam in the field of knowledge

With the arrival of western education in India, Moulānā saw the change in the mindset of the people; people were no longer satisfied with narration alone but wished to know the wisdom and secret behind each law. This is why Moulānā began substantiating each law of dīn and his books comprise more of logical reasoning than narration. This change in the mindset of the people was first perceived by Moulānā Shāh Walī Allāh Muḥaddith Delhwī رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّٰهُ (1114 A.H-1174 A.H), which is the reason for his authorship of his famous book- Ḥujjat Allāh al-Bālighah, in which he presented the wisdoms behind each tenet of dīn.

After Shāh Walī Allāh رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّٰهُ, it was Moulānā Qāsim Nānotwī رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّٰهُ who rendered

services in this direction. The services of Moulānā Nānotwī رحمه الله differed from that of Shāh Walī Allāh رحمه الله in three aspects:

1. Shāh Walī Allāh رحمه الله did not debate matters pertaining to belief separately, whereas Moulānā Nānotwī رحمه الله discussed it as a separate subject explaining its law and principles. This is one of the great achievements of his life.
2. Shāh Walī Allāh رحمه الله would explain the wisdom behind the laws of dīn in general or only regarding specific acts mentioned in ḥadīth and not each and every act, whereas Moulānā Nānotwī رحمه الله explained the wisdom behind even the most trivial of acts and at times also highlighted the wisdom behind what the fuqahā describe as *Khilāf al-Qiyās* (acts contrary to reasoning) proving them to be in accordance with reason after all. However, it is unfortunate that more could not be done in this line but whatever has been serves as a guide and proof for us. The senior scholars who came later took this effort further. *Al-Masāliḥ al-ʿAqaliyyah li Aḥkām al-Naqlīyah* of Moulānā Nānotwī رحمه الله as well as of other scholars is worth reading in this regard.
3. The substantiations of Shāh Walī Allāh رحمه الله were based more upon reasoning and logic whereas Moulānā Nānotwī رحمه الله was able to make even the most intricate and purely logical reasoning perceivable. This was unique to his literary works which cannot be found anywhere else.

The same can be said for both Moulānā Nānotwī رحمه الله and Shāh Walī Allāh رحمه الله that their knowledge was more inspired than derived only from books. Allah Taʿālā had granted both of them a great share of inspired knowledge.

Whatever the case, Moulānā Nānotwī رحمه الله wrote thirty-six books to guide this Ummah, which can be divided into three categories:

1. easy
2. difficult
3. intricate

Easy books

1. ***Qiblah Numā***- This is in Urdu, which explains that the Kaʿbah is not an object of worship but the direction one faces during worship. Only the first quarter is easy.

2. ***Hadiyyat al-Shīʿah***- This is in Urdu, which debates matters of difference with the Shīʿah. This is the easiest of all his books.

3. ***Tuḥfah Laḥmiyyah***- This is in Urdu, which explains that consumption of meat is the natural inclination of man. This was jointly written by Moulānā and one of his close friends.

4. ***Ajwibah Arbaʿīn***- This is in Urdu and in two volumes. It provides answers to forty questions posed by the Shīʿah. The first volume was jointly written by Moulānā رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّٰهُ and Moulānā ʿAbd Allāh Anbītawī رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّٰهُ. The second volume was written by Moulānā رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّٰهُ alone.

5. ***Fuyūḍ-e Qāsimiyyah***- This is in Urdu and Fārsi. This book discusses various topics. The discussion on Jumuʿah in villages was translated and published separately under the title: *Laws of Jumuʿah*, which is why we have not mentioned it as a separate book.

6. ***Wāqiʿah Mehlah Khudā Shanāsi***- This is in Urdu. It is a discussion of the truth of dīn which took place in his first debate in Shāh Jahānpūr 1293 A.H. Munshi Muḥammad Ḥāshim, owner of Ḥāshimī publications and Moulānā Muḥammad Ḥayāt, owner of Ḍhiyā'ī publications, printed and published this jointly. The entire debate of Moulānā Nānotwī رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّٰهُ has been related in it.

7. ***Mubāḥathah Shāh Jahānpūr***- This is in Urdu and also discusses the truth of dīn and a refutation of Christianity. This is the second debate that took place in Shāh Jahānpūr in 1295 A.H. It was compiled by Moulānā Fakhr al-Ḥasan Ghanghohī رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّٰهُ and Shaykh al-Hind رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّٰهُ.

8. ***Laṭāif-e Qāsimiyyah***- This is in Fārsi. It discusses various topics and is a

compilation of nine treatises, the last of which is regarding Jumūʿah in villages. Also in this book is *Al-Ḥaqq al-Ṣarīḥ fi Ithbāt al-Tarāwīḥ* which comprises of the treatise of Moulānā Nānotwī رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ and Moulānā Ghanghohī رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ. This is why *Al-Haqq al-Ṣarīḥ* has not been mentioned separately.

9. ***Taṣfiyyat al-ʿAqā'id***- This is in Urdu and debates the principles and beliefs of dīn. It is a reply to the letter of Sar Sayyid.

10. ***Intiṣār al-Islam***- This is in Urdu. It is a reply to ten objections raised against Islam's teachings. The *Majlis Maʿārif al-Qur'ān* edition surpasses all previous editions.

11. ***Ḥujjat al-Islām***- This is in Urdu and discusses matters pertaining to dīn and belief, and is a must-read for every Muslim. The *Majlis Maʿārif al-Qur'ān* edition surpasses all previous editions.

12. ***Qasā'id-e Qāsimī***- This is in Urdu, Fārsi and Arabic. It is a collection of poetic renditions on various topics.

13. ***Makātīb-e Qāsimī***- This is in Fārsi and is a compilation of the letters written by Moulānā Nānotwī رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ.

14. ***Al-Ajwibah al-Kāmilah fi Aswilah al-Khāmilah***- This is in Urdu and is a reply to five baseless objections by a Shīʿah.

15. ***Hāshiyyah al-Bukhārī***- This is in Arabic. The sub-notes of *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* written by Moulānā Aḥmad ʿAlī Sahāranpūrī رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ, which is generally found in all copies of *Ṣaḥih al-Bukhārī* ; the final five chapters were written by Moulānā Nānotwī رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ.

All of these books were easy, even though the subject matter extremely weighty. The method of elucidation was not just simple and easy but extremely so, such that any person is able to derive benefit from it.

Difficult books

1. ***Maṣābīḥ al-Tarāwīḥ***- This is in Fārsi and the subject matter is apparent from the title. In addition, other amazing and intricate facts have also been discussed relating to the topic. This book was translated by Moulānā Ishtiyāq Aḥmad Deobandī رحمه الله, which has been published under the name *Anwār al-Maṣābīḥ*. However, this book has not been analysed as it should have been and work still remains to be done on it.

2. ***Taqrīr Dil Pazīr***- This is in Urdu and debates many issues. It was not completed and comprises of only what was written.

3. ***Barāḥīn-e Qāsimiyyah***- This is in Urdu and debates several issues pertaining to dīn and belief. It was jointly written by Moulānā Nānotwī رحمه الله and his student- Moulānā ʿAbd al-ʿAlī رحمه الله.

4. ***Taḥdhīr al-Nās min Inkār Athar Ibn ʿAbbās***- This is in Urdu. ʿAbd Allāh ibn ʿAbbās رضي الله عنه states that there are seven earths and on each earth ambiyā' were sent. This book is a detailed discussion of this report. In addition a detailed discussion on the finality of nubuwwah was also included. This book became extremely popular and widely accepted during Moulānā's رحمه الله lifetime. Many individuals raised objections to this book and their objections were replied by Moulānā رحمه الله himself.

5. ***Jawābāt Maʿḍūrāt al-ʿAshar***- This is in Urdu. This comprises of ten objections raised by Moulānā ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz رحمه الله on the book *Taḥdhīr al-Nās min Inkāri Athar Ibn ʿAbbās* and the replies given to it by Moulānā. These objections were not raised in refutation but rather in search of knowledge, such that Moulānā ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz رحمه الله later agreed with the opinions of Moulānā Nānotwī رحمه الله after hearing his replies. In addition, Moulānā ʿAbd al-Qādir al-Badāyunī رحمه الله also objected to this book and published a refutation of it under the name-*Fasīḥ al-dīn Badāyunī*. Moulānā Nānotwī رحمه الله replied to this book. The original as well a copy of it can be found in the library of Moulānā ʿAbd al-Ghanī رحمه الله. Another copy of it can be found in the personal library of Moulānā Qārī Muḥammad Ṭayyab رحمه الله.

Another person, who most probably resided in Rampur, also raised objection to *Taḥdhīr al-Nās*. Moulānā Nānotwī رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّٰهُ also replied to his objections and a written copy of this can be found in Palāwaddah. The student of Moulānā- Moulānā Aḥmad Ḥasan Amrohawī رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّٰهُ, also wrote a reply to his objections. A written copy of it can also be found in Palāwaddah. It was this very book which Aḥmad Raḍhā Khan Barelwī misquoted and misinterpreted, in his propaganda against Moulānā Nānotwī رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّٰهُ. However as the saying goes:

> Whoever tries to blow out the flame ignited by Allah
> Will burn his beard but the flame will not be extinguished

6. ***Asrār-e Qur'ānī***- This is in Fārsi and is a substantiated reply to all questions relating to the Qur'ān. The commentary of Muʿowadhatayn- (Sūrah al-Falaq and Sūrah al-Nās) is also included in this book.

7. ***Intibāḥ al-Mu'minīn***- This is in Fārsi. This is a commentary of a ḥadīth reported in *al-Mishkāt al-Maṣābīḥ* (under the chapter of the virtues of the ʿAsharah Mubasharah in the third section), narrated by ʿAlī رَضِيَ ٱللَّٰهُ عَنْهُ regarding the khulafā of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ.

8. ***Jamāl-e Qāsimī***- This is in Urdu and discusses the aspects of *Simāʿa al-Mowtā*, *Waḥdat al-Wujūd* and *Ḥayāt al-Nabī*. This is a compilation of two books.

9. ***Towthīq al-Kalām fī al-Inṣāt Khalf al-Imām***- Also called *Al-Dalīl al-Muḥkam fī al-Inṣāt Khalf al-Imām* and is in Urdu. It discusses the reason why one following the imām should not recite Qirāʿah behind the imām. Both names refer to the same book but in *Towthīq* there are a few additional lines.

10. ***Makātīb-e Qāsim al-ʿUlūm***- This is in four volumes comprising of eleven letters, ten of which are Moulānā Nānotwī's رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّٰهُ: a discussion on Fadak, a commentary on ḥadīth al-ʿUmmā, a discussion on what has been slaughtered in the name of others besides Allah, the *ʿiṣmah* (infallibility) of the ambiyā', a solution to aḥādīth that seem to contradict each other

regarding a Makātab[1], a reply to a letter by the Ahl al-Ḥadīth ʿĀlim- Moulānā Muḥammad Ḥusayn al-Batālawī, a reply to those who deny nubuwwah and the miracles of the ambiyā', the ruling regarding taking of interest in India and the income received from a land left in trust, the martyrdom of Ḥusayn ﷺ and a discussion on the issue of *Imāmah* and a reply to the substantiation of Al-Ṭusī and a commentary of the two aḥādīth. The eleventh is a commentary on the ḥadīth: "He who does not recognise the imām of his time".

All these are in Fārsi. The letters- one to seven, have been translated by Moulānā Qārī Ṭayyab رحمه الله, which have been published in the twelfth volume of *Al-Qāsim.* It has been presently edited and simplified by Professor Anwār al-Ḥasan Sherkotī, now Pakistani, and published under the title of *Anwār al-Nujūm*. Unfortunately I have not been able to read this as yet.[2]

11. ***Al-Haẓ al-Maqsūm min Qāsim al-ʿUlūm***- This is in Arabic and is a discussion on ***Al-Juz al-ladhī lā Yatajazzī*** and a research into poetic rendition and music. It comprises of two letters of Moulānā Rahīmullāh Bijonwarī رحمه الله- student of Moulānā Nānotwī رحمه الله, written in eloquent Arabic. It concludes with mention of two miraculous feats of Moulānā Nānotwī رحمه الله.

These were the difficult books of Moulānā Nānotwī رحمه الله and how true was the statement of Moulānā Qārī Ṭayyib رحمه الله regarding them:

> The wisdom of these books is like a huge and fertile country, which contain all the necessities of life, having no shortage of provisions or treasures. It has all the required modes of transport but the road to this country is

1 Makātab: A slave with whom an agreement has been reached upon dispensation of a fixed sum in exchange for his freedom.

2 This was at the time that the book was written but now I have managed to obtain and read it. The author has made a splendid effort but this book has not been solved as yet and an intricate book such as this cannot be understood by mere translation. Thus, much work still remains to be done in this regard.

> hidden and very difficult to travel. There are no signs which make traversing this road easier nor any indications through which one can perceive the fertility of the land and take benefit from it. Apart from a select few, none possess any knowledge of this country or know of the road to it. Without a doubt the wisdom and knowledge of Moulānā Qāsim Nānotwī رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّٰهُ is like this country and because of the lack of signs, hints, necessary directions, footnotes, tables of contents and translations, even the general ʿulamā cannot benefit from it, let alone the common masses.[1]

Intricate books

1. ***Qiblah Numā***- The Kaʿbah is not an object of worship but rather the direction faced during ṣalāh. The final three quarters of this book are extremely difficult. Moulānā Ishtiyāq Aḥmad رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّٰهُ has rendered great service to it but still it cannot be understood appropriately. Qārī Ṭayyab رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّٰهُ has also written a detailed commentary on it but sadly it has been lost.

2. ***Makātīb-e Qāsim al-ʿUlūm***- The letter which contains the commentary of *Ḥadīth al-ʿUmmā* is extremely difficult.

3. ***Āb Ḥayāt***- This is in Urdu and proves that the ambiyā' are alive in their graves. This is understood to be the most difficult of all Moulānā's books. Even though Moulānā Yaʿqūb Nānotwī رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّٰهُ had a portion of it removed, as he was of the opinion that none would be able to understand it (these extracted portions of *Āb Ḥayāt* are in Pilāwaddah), there still remains a dire need for a commentary to be written on it. Perhaps Allah Taʿālā will grant me the ability to fulfill this service.

This is a total of thirty-six books, wherein the wisdom of Moulānā Qāsim Nānotwī رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّٰهُ glimmers like pearls. Moulānā Qārī Ṭayyib رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّٰهُ writes in praise of this wisdom:

> The introduction to his books comes naturally such that the most important points glare one in the face. Every discussion is substantiated

1 The introduction of *Anwār al-Maṣābīḥ*, page 15, 16

and well-laid out such that it appeals to the mind and its intricacies easily understood. In addition, Moulānā's step by step method of explanation removes all doubts and misgivings in a clear and manifest manner such that thousands of other similar aspects are resolved, even if it is related to a different chapter. All these aspects are solved by his systematic approach and in fact many doors of knowledge and understanding are opened to the heart. A person is forced to accept that this aspect of Sharīʿah is so logical and within reason that it seems as if that is the only natural conclusion.

In the words of Moulānā Muḥammad Yaʿqūb رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّٰهُ (first principal of Dār al-ʿUlūm Deoband):

> Moulānā Nānotwī رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّٰهُ had a philosophical mind, which is why such deep concepts came naturally to him and as a result when discussing various laws of Sharīʿah, he would do so from a philosophical point of view, resulting in not only that one aspect being resolved but thousand others like it. In so doing the wisdom of his philosophical view became apparent.

Nevertheless bringing various laws of Sharīʿah under one logical principle and extracting intricate laws from this principle or to gather various aspects and laws of Sharīʿah and extract one principle that governs them all, was unique to the knowledge of Moulānā رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّٰهُ.[1]

What is even more astonishing is that generally logic and reasoning relates to the derivation of laws and not ḥadīth. It can be said that this law is logical or within reason but it is very difficult to say the same regarding a ḥadīth; that it is within reason and logic dictates that this be the ruling. However, according to Moulānā Qāsim Nānotwī رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّٰهُ even the narrations in ḥadīth were not beyond reason and logic. His deep insight saw the logic and reason within narration just as he saw the logic and reason within the various laws of dīn. For example, according to Moulānā the Kaʿbah being situated where it is today, it being the first House of

1 *Hikmat-e Qāsimī* page 20-22

Allah, the building of al-Masjid al-Aqsā forty years after the Kaʿbah, even the distance between the Kaʿbah and al-Masjid al-Aqsā, which is approximately two hundred and fifty or three hundred miles, all fall within logical reasoning and are not mere historic facts or coincidences. The details of this can all be read in his book *Qiblah Numā*.[1]

1 *Hikmat-e Qāsimī* page 22, 23

Foreword

In the name of Allah, Most gracious, Most Merciful

We praise Allah and send peace and blessings upon His noble messenger Muḥammad رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّٰهُ.

The book before you is entitled- *Hadiyyat al-Shīʿah* and in reality there is no necessity to write anything further about it, which might even perhaps be disrespectful, as it is the written work of Ḥujjat al-Islam, the mentor of ʿulamā, Moulānā Muḥammad Qāsim Nānotwī رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّٰهُ, the founder and rector of Dār al-ʿUlūm Deoband, whose name alone is sufficient certification for the veracity of this book.

In essence, this book is a detailed reply to a letter of a Shīʿī scholar by the name of ʿAmmār ʿAlī, who posed a few questions regarding the issue of khilāfah and Fadak, which prompted Moulānā Nānotwī رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّٰهُ to pen a detailed treatise on the topic, substantiating the standpoint of the Ahl al-Sunnah wa l-Jamāʿah.

This book reveals the deep knowledge with which Moulānā Nānotwī رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّٰهُ was inspired with. This book was written in the year 1284 A.H and various editions have since been published, gaining worldwide acceptance, but these editions did not contain paragraphs or any sub-chapters, which made benefitting from this book extremely strenuous. May Allah Taʿālā reward Moulānā Muḥammad Aslam رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّٰهُ, who took the liberty of separating the content into paragraphs under various sub-chapters, which then made it possible to list the contents of the book in an index. This increased the benefit of the book tenfold. Moulānā, to the best of his abilities, has also endeavoured not to change the actual wording of Moulānā Nānotwī رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّٰهُ in any way.

Moulānā has also translated the Arabic text, making it easier for those only acquainted with the Urdu language to benefit from this book.[1]

Only sub-chapters were added and the actual content is absolutely unchanged. This new edition was printed by the publishing house of Moulānā Muḥammad Aslam رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّٰهُ- *Maktabah Haqqāniyyah*, roughly in the year 1962 and has now been reprinted by *Nuʿmānī Kutub Khānah* in Lahore.

We ask Allah Taʿālā to accept this effort.
Āmīn

Bashīr Aḥmad
Principal of Nuʿmānī Kutub Khānah
Lahore

15 Dhū al-Ḥijjah 1397 A.H
27 November 1977

1 The original book was written in the Urdu language and the translation of verses of the Qur'ān and other Arabic passages were accompanied without any translation. This service was rendered by Moulānā Aslam, may Allāh Ta'ālā reward him abundantly for his services.

Introduction

All praise belongs to Allah, peace and salutations upon the leader of the ambiyā', upon his progeny and all his companions.

I express my immense gratitude to Allah Taʿālā, whose grace and mercy has awarded an unworthy student such as myself the opportunity to revive this scholastic legacy. I had been thinking of publishing this work for some time but my efforts were limited to thoughts only, as I did not have a copy of this book in my possession and it was virtually impossible to obtain, as if it did not exist. However, Allah Taʿ ālā made it such that a knowledgeable friend arrived at my door one day, placing before me a stack of books, which required binding urgently. As I went through the stack, to my delight, the book I so desired was amongst them as well. At that time, I only undertook the task of re-binding the books and he left; it was only after much persuasion that he agreed to leave the book in my possession. The task was a great one, requiring much dedication, whereas all I possessed was weakness. The book remained in my possession for some time and all I did was ponder over the daunting task that lay ahead of me. During this time a much larger publishing house intended to print it and even took the book from me but they too returned it after sometime, with the excuse of preoccupation.

As soon as I got the book, it left my possession again and then again was returned to me, which made it clear that no further stalling could be tolerated and work should begin immediately. However, once I began reading the book, I realised how truly difficult my task was, as the book was continuous with no paragraphs, chapters, sub-chapters or even headings, as was the practice of the earlier scholars. This method was also apt for that era as they were conscientious, hard-working, book-worms and true appreciators of knowledge, who were satiated by reading and research.

However, now such exertion is rare and no pleasure is derived from scholastic or spiritual research. Instead, to a great extent, false narrations and fables are

relied upon. It was now necessary to present this knowledge in an appealing and easy to read manner, so that those who desire knowledge will not experience any difficulty. I found a person to carry out this task for me, edit and place the content into chapters; but I am forced to ashamedly say that whatever service he rendered he did so without even perusing the book and relied upon his own understanding of the subject. This was yet another hurdle, which could only be overcome by undertaking to accomplish this task myself. I then formulated the chapters myself; a few chapters based upon the core content and a few additional sub-chapters. Yet the content could not be entirely presented in the table of contents as the calibre and depth of the book is such that in every two lines, a new point, new discussion and new sub-chapter can be found. It is obvious that all of these could not possibly be listed under separate chapters, thus the complete content of the book could not be listed in the index.

The book itself has its own unique distinction, as if it is restless on account of its addressees not accepting the truth or agitated as to why the author cannot transmit the truth directly into their hearts. Despite the great depth of knowledge it contains, it has been simplified to such an extent that the most intricate discussions have been made easy to understand. It is as if it holds one's hand and leads him through each discussion, with each discussion flowing easily into the next. In spite of the deep insight and astounding level of knowledge that is expounded, the humility with which it is presented is evident, with no claims of superiority or demeaning remarks made. Worthy of note is the respect and reverence that is awarded to the Ṣaḥābah and Ahl al-Bayt in every chapter, which is sorely lacking in today's era.

If I were to list the unique features of this book then I would firstly have to say that its greatest characteristic is that it is the work of the founder of Dār al-ʿUlūm Deoband. This is not an empty expression of loyalty but an undeniable fact, as the superiority and eminence of Moulānā Nānotwī رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّٰهُ was acknowledged by all and still is.

The second unique feature of this book is that both angles were taken into consideration when substantiating. In other words, in addition to the proof of narration or recorded text, logical reasoning was also cited. In fact, many matters were explained in terms of common understanding and reasoning.

The third unique feature is the explanation of verses in favour of the noble Ṣaḥābah, which is to a great extent inspired knowledge. The meaning and implication of words that are explained is utterly astonishing and the best books of tafsīr too have not reached this level.

The fourth unique feature is the scholastic investigation and analysis of certain verses and ahādīth, which are substantiated from by the other party. The truly remarkable aspect of this is that after the elaboration of the author, one is astonished as to how it was ever possible for them to have perceived this to be a proof for their claims, whereas in actual fact it proves our standpoint. The wisdom which is expounded is truly remarkable, clearly not self-attained but awarded by Allah Taʿālā.

The fifth unique feature is the comprehensiveness of each discussion, which covers a range of aspects and is extremely valuable. The words of Moulānā Yusuf Binorī رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّهُ are indeed true:

> *Hadiyyat al-Shīʿah* is more explanatory than *Tuhfah Ithnā ʿAshariyyah*.

The sixth unique feature is the simple and uncomplicated manner of this book, which is apparent when compared to the other literary works of Moulānā Nānotwī رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّهُ. The majority of the book is in simple spoken language but in some cases (a very few in fact), due to the scholastic nature of the discussion, a little difficulty might be experienced. The reason for this is obvious and in such pure academic discussions such difficulty is experienced by all.

Finally, I wish to add that an ardent effort was made to maintain consistency between the book and the sub-chapters and compliment the high-level of

knowledge found in the book, but who are we and where is this book and its excellence? Our intention was only to inform the reader of the contents of the book, which with the grace of Allah, we were able to do.

In conclusion, I wish to end with the eulogy of Sar Sayyid, which he wrote in tribute to Moulānā Muḥammad Qāsim Nānotwī رحمه الله.

Moulānā Qāsim Nānotwī in the eyes of Sar Sayyid

On the demise of Moulānā Qāsim Nānotwī رحمه الله, Sar Sayyid wrote an eulogy in *ʿAlīgharh Institute Gazette* (24 April 1880). The words with which Sar Sayyid expressed his regard for Moulānā Nānotwī رحمه الله, in addition to being free from any form of contemporary rivalry, is an open acknowledgement of the excellence, knowledge, piety and taqwā of Moulānā Qāsim Nānotwī رحمه الله. It goes without saying that this eulogy is free from any form of blind allegiance. When a person praises his contemporary in such words, especially when he severely opposes the beliefs, views and ideologies of the latter, then it is most certainly worthy of note. What was the regard that they had for each other, this can only be understood from the booklet- *Taṣfīyyat al-ʿAqā'id*, which comprises of the correspondences between these two personalities. In this booklet, Sar Sayyid writes to a friend of his (Munshī Muḥammad ʿĀrif):

> If Jānab Molwī Muḥammad Qāsim ṣahib were to attend then it will be my good fortune and I will regard his flattery to be an honour.[1]

In reply to this letter, Moulānā Nānotwī رحمه الله wrote to the same friend of Sar Sayyid:

> Yes, there is no doubt that the courage and concern of the rumoured Sayyid (Sar Sayyid) is acknowledged by the people of Islam and if on account of this one were to love him then it would be fitting but on account of and

1 *Tasfiyyat al-ʿAqā'id* page 3

> more so on account of hearing of his incorrect beliefs, I am apprehensive and displeased with him.[1]

After having read this, now examine the eulogy of Sar Sayyid:

> It is sad that the esteemed sir (Moulānā Muḥammad Qāsim Nānotwī رحمه الله) has passed away on 15 April 1880 in Deoband on account of asthma. Time itself has wept for him and will continue to do so in the future as well but to weep for such a person, after whom no successor can be seen, is a cause of severe grief and pain. There was a time when amongst the ʿulamā there were such personalities who were well-known for their knowledge, excellence, piety and taqwā. They were unmatched as far as their simplicity, austerity and purity of heart were concerned. People thought that after the death of Moulānā Muḥammad Isḥāq رحمه الله no person would be born capable of equalling him but Moulānā Muḥammad Qāsim Nānotwī, through his untainted piety, religiousness, taqwā and austerity proved that Allah Taʿālā had indeed created a person equal to Moulānā Muḥammad Isḥāq and in some aspects even surpassed him. There are many people who saw Moulānā Nānotwī seeking knowledge at a very young age. He studied all books under Moulānā Mamlūk ʿAlī and the signs of taqwā, piety, purity of heart, and obedience to Allah stood out very early, and the following poem is most apt in describing him:
>
> *He surpassed all brilliance in intelligence and reached beyond the furthest star*
>
> Just as he was known for his intelligence, aptitude and deep understanding during his student days so was he known for the excellence of his character, piety and worship of Allah Taʿālā. His time spent in the company of Moulānā Muzaffar Ḥusayn Khāndhlāwī made him an ardent follower of the Sunnah and the company of Ḥājjī Imdād Allāh رحمه الله blessed him with a spiritually illuminated heart. He was himself strict in adhering to the Sharīʿah and Sunnah and also strove to make others adhere to the laws

1 *Tasfiyyat al-ʿAqāʾid* page 6

of Sharīʿah and the Sunnah. He was also extremely concerned about the condition of the general Muslims. It was through his efforts that an extremely beneficial institution of Islamic learning was established in Deoband and a most beautiful masjid built. In addition to this, through his efforts other institutions were also erected. He had no desire to become a spiritual guide or shaykh but thousands of Muslims in India, especially in the southern and western provinces, regard him as such.

A few were angry at him on account of differences of opinion and he too was angry with them but to the best of my knowledge there was no action of Moulānā Qāsim Nānotwī رحمه الله, even his anger at a person or pleasure at another, that can be said to be based upon his personal ambition or enmity. Every action of his, regardless of how many they may be, was solely for the pleasure of Allah and in seeking the reward of the hereafter. He followed that which he thought to be the truth and true. His anger at a person was only for Allah and his pleasure with a person was also only for Allah. He did not regard any person as good or bad on account of his relationship with him but would only think a person such if he would perpetrate or say something that was incorrect. He would regard that person as evil on account of Allah. Loving for the pleasure of Allah and hating for the pleasure of Allah was his trait. His habits were angelic in nature and I loved him from my heart and without a doubt a person who spent his life with such virtue is deserving of love.

All people of this age, even those with whom he had a difference of opinion, acknowledge that Moulānā Muḥammad Qāsim Nānotwī رحمه الله was unmatched. His knowledge in this era is perhaps slightly less than Shāh ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz Muhaddith Delhwī, perhaps even exceeding him in other aspects. In simplicity, austerity and piety if he has not surpassed Moulānā Muḥammad Isḥāq then he has definitely equalled him. He was without a doubt similar to an angel with saintly attributes and to be deprived of such a person is definitely a cause of grief and pain for those forced to live without him.

It is sad that our people instead of honouring him through practice only do so with words of praise and admiration. It does not befit our people to merely voice a few words of grief or lament for a while when such a personality is lifted from our midst or shed a few tears and then wipe them away, instead it is incumbent upon them to continue the legacy of such a personality and engrave it in the hearts of the nation.

بِسۡمِ ٱللَّهِ ٱلرَّحۡمَٰنِ ٱلرَّحِيمِ

Hadiyyat al-Shīʿah

All praise belongs to Allah, Rabb of the entire universe, the Most Gracious, Most merciful, Master of the Day of Judgement. Peace and salutations upon His messenger, our master Muḥammad صَلَّىٱللَّهُعَلَيۡهِوَسَلَّمَ, the nabī of *raḥmah* (mercy), upon his progeny, wives, Ahl al-Bayt, and all his companions.

After reciting praise upon Allah and sending salutations upon Rasūlullāh صَلَّىٱللَّهُعَلَيۡهِوَسَلَّمَ; this unworthy and insignificant one, by the name of Muḥammad Qāsim, wishes to present before you these few pages. At the end of Rajab 1283 A.H, the esteemed scholar, pride of the ʿulamā, guide of the ummah, possessor of all meritorious qualities both inner and outer- Moulānā Rashīd Aḥmad Ghanghohī forwarded a letter to me written by a Shīʿī scholar by the name of ʿAmmār ʿAlī. The letter consisted of a number of Shīʿī fabrications. The purpose of sending this letter to me was so that I could reply to these fabrications and forward it to Moulānā. On the suggestion of a few friends, a few of whom have family ties to me, I had already begun to use my free time to pen logical proofs for the beliefs of tauḥīd and risālat. This is one reason for my delay in beginning this work and another reason was my own inability and shortcomings. My own unworthiness and constant daily preoccupations resulted in my heart and mind becoming more strained. In essence, this was a difficult task but I was unable to refuse an order from Moulānā, thus I postponed my writing on tauḥīd and risālat and finally began writing a reply to this letter a few days after it had arrived. Due to a number of reasons, such as my own weakness, lack of resources and time, I was unable to complete this reply in one sitting but after writing on a few different occasions, I finally completed on Safar 1284 A.H. After completion I entitled these pages *Hadiyyat al-Shīʿah* (A gift for the shīʿah).

Reason for the title

The reason for this title, even though the book is in favour of the Ahl al-Sunnah wa l-Jamāʿah and should therefore more aptly be entitled *Hadiyyat Ahl al-Sunnah* (A gift for the Ahl al-Sunnah), is that it is of more benefit for the Shīʿah than it is for the Ahl al-Sunnah. In favour of the Ahl al-Sunnah, it will either benefit those of weak faith by granting them conviction or those with conviction by granting them contentment, whereas in the case of the Shīʿah; if they are fair-minded, it will grant them īmān. The reason for this is that in these pages, three sources have been substantiated from: the Noble Qur'ān, ahādīth from the books of the Shīʿah and lastly clear logical proofs, all of which are accepted by the Shīʿah.

It is possible that one might object on account of my anonymity that every person substantiates whatever he desires, so how do we know that you truly understand the method of substantiation? The reply to this is simply that this treatise is before you, do not take my word for it but read it for yourself. The person who wrote it might not be perfect but what he has written in absolutely correct. Through the blessings of the Ahl al-Bayt and the Ṣaḥābah, I have complete conviction that the contents herein will prove to be beneficial. If anyone were to still object, then it should be said to him:

> *Sometimes even an immature child can hit the target with his arrow*

This is absolutely true, who does not know the reality of himself. In essence whatever is said about me will be correct but the claim of this treatise being the truth is not incorrect. Allah willing, this will be decided after completing the treatise.

Surely if a foolish prejudiced bigot keeps repeating the same objection then this is to be expected, as this is what prejudiced bigots do. However, if an intelligent person were to act in the same manner then I still object, as replying to a book or letter means that you have refuted every substantiation of the latter, as I have done with the letter of ʿAmmār ʿAlī (which will become evident shortly), and not

simply object to one or two aspects. The reality is such that every person may faulter in one or two matters, after all we are but human and I the lowest of them all. I am neither a god nor a rasūl, who is free from all error. I do not deny the possibility of having erred or forgotten, so the authenticity and reliability of the book should be gauged by the majority.

In short, if any intelligent person wishes to reply to my book then he should follow in the footsteps of this unworthy one and refute every substantiation of every discourse. At the least adhere to the rules of debate and object to the proof of every claim that was made. Proving three or four aspects to be incorrect will not suffice, as I too admit that I am not above error or mistake. So there should be no astonishment if you were to come across a few errors. I have high hopes from the fair-minded that they will not raise any objections to this book but would rather appreciate my effort.

Perceived disrespect

If you happen to see any text that might be seemingly disrespectful towards the ambiyā', Ahl al-Bayt or Ṣaḥābah of Rasūlullāh ﷺ then this humble author is not to blame for it, as such an approach was adopted from time to time as a retaliatory reply against the Shīʿah and the consequences thereof will hang on their shoulders. It was they who forced our hand and Allah is my witness that I am free from any such beliefs and regard loving these saints as good fortune and possessing a positive attitude towards them, a means of salvation in the hereafter. I am hopeful that Allah will accept my excuse on account of the circumstances under which I was forced to make these statements.

Quoting narrations

If in quoting Shīʿah narrations I have shown some hesitancy at times then too it is allowed for a few reasons:

1. Who has the books of the Shīʿah in their possession? What benefit would there be in a Sunnī gathering all Shīʿī books?

2. The Shīʿah in accordance with the saying: "People of the house know better of the condition of the house" will be acquainted with the immorality their works contain but where is a Sunnī to find all these critical, degrading, contemptuous and obscure narrations, as they are nowhere to be found in his books.

3. In accordance with the saying: "A person scrutinises others based upon his scrutiny of himself", the false perception of the Shīʿah has not allowed them to trust the Sunnī, so we wholly understand why the Shīʿah consider the Sunnī to be on falsehood.

Hence on account of the above, especially the first point, if a Shīʿah were to still object then it is on him.

Reliance upon *Tuḥfah Ithnā ʿAshariyyah*

On account of the saying:

الصدق ينجى و الكذب يهلك

> Honesty leads to salvation and falsehood to destruction.

This honest one admits that he did not have any Shīʿah sources to refer to except *Tuḥfah Ithnā ʿAshariyyah* and when I had *Tuḥfah* then those of knowledge know that I had everything, in accordance with the poem:

> It is sufficient to console me; just one glance at you

As well as:

> None of the books do I have but *Tuḥfah* is all of them

The reason for this is that the book is the masterpiece of the renowned Sunnī Muhaddith- Shāh ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz al-Delhwī رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّهُ, whose immense knowledge and

research is acknowledged by Shīʿī ʿulamā as well, even if they do not verbally admit it. So I have relied upon those narrations of the Shīʿah that are reported in *Tuḥfah*, either in its primary text or sub-notes, which is considered to be no less than a reference to their primary source books by the scholars. This is the reason why this unworthy one cited references from it without any second thought.

A sincere council

I advise the fair-minded from amongst the Shīʿah to not disregard the intelligence and aptitude of the author of *Tuḥfah* on account of my lack of resources but check the references with your own books. The majority of the references that are cited are well-known relied upon works of the Shīʿah, there are no references to books that are impossible to find or never heard of. If you find the reference to be correct then you will have to accept it. However, Allah Taʿālā has himself said:

> Whoever He leads astray, there is no one who can guide him.

So what are the chances of this happening when in the words of Allah Taʿālā they are unable to find that which is able to make them understand? Where is the word of Allah and where is the word of the unworthy one?

Furthermore, the truth is only there for acceptance; if one accepts the truth then what harm is there? Nonetheless do not be lethargic in checking the reference, if any discrepancy is found then it is my responsibility.

However, I know full-well that the Shīʿah are aware of this without me mentioning it, who is not aware of the fact that according to the Ahl al-Sunnah, falsehood — especially in matters of dīn — is strictly prohibited and a heinous sin. We are not of the same ilk as the Shīʿī scholar ʿAmmār ʿAlī who portrays himself to be a sparkling gem but he deceivingly passes fabrications and incorrect narrations to be authentic and weak to be reliable. It is a fallacious lie to invent a source for something that is purely fiction. The deception that was perpetrated by ʿAmmār ʿAlī in his letter will become clear as one proceeds further with this treatise.

We were under the impression that the falsehood of the Shīʿah had ended with the scholars of the past but unfortunately their successors have continued the legacy. Claiming that the narrations of the garden of Fadak being gifted to Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها is reported in the reliable books of the Ahl al-Sunnah wa l-Jamā'ah and claiming that the beloved daughters of Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم (Zaynab, Ruqayyah, and Ummī Kulthūm رضي الله عنهن) were not his offspring are the actions of the leader of the Shīʿī ʿAmmār ʿAlī, who follows in the footsteps of his deceiving Shīʿah mentors.

If one desires to lie then lie in such a way that is believable and can be accepted by people but I have never seen such a fabrication, simply because a person intended to become Sunnī, that neither was Allah Taʿālā or Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم given any consideration nor even the innocent A'immah. It can still be said regarding the failure to mention the nikāḥ of Ummī Kulthūm bint Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها to the second khalīfah- ʿUmar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb رضي الله عنه, even though difficult, that failing to mention it is not a denial of it having occurred, but claiming that Sayyidah Ruqayyah and her sisters رضي الله عنهن were not the daughters of Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم and that the narration of Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم giving Fadak to Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها can be found in the reliable books of the Ahl al-Sunnah wa l-Jamā'ah is such a blatant lie that no form of interpretation can camouflage its fallaciousness. After reading this entire treatise, you will see the truth of my words, Allah willing.

An interesting angle to the deceit

On closer inspection, one cannot blame ʿAmmār ʿAlī, as at the end of the day the Ahl al-Sunnah is the correct *madhab* (code of belief) based upon the testimony of the Qur'ān and the family of Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم, whereas the madhab of the Shīʿah is false based upon the testimony of the Qur'ān and the family of Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم. Yet, despite these testimonies, he continued seeing his leaders and scholars calling the madhab of the Ahl al-Sunnah false and the madhab of the Shīʿah true. As a result of this he became confused, due to his sincere reliance upon his scholars, and thought that it is correct to call falsehood the truth. And why should he not when he is one of the leading scholars of the Shīʿah himself?

While reciting spontaneous verses of the Qur'ān, the following verse of Sūrah al-Aḥzāb inadvertently escaped my lips:

وَاللّٰهُ لَا يَسْتَحْيٖ مِنَ الْحَقِّ

> Allah does not shy away from the truth.

Since ʿAmmār ʿAlī, according to his own claims, desires only to obey Allah Taʿālā, he should ensure that he abstains from all falsehood when relaying his opinions. Instead he has opted to act contrary to the character of Allah Taʿālā and blacken his face with falsehood, following in the footsteps of his predecessors (which he regards to be meritorious whereas they were cursed by the illustrious A'immah and labelled as liars after being deeply grieved by their deceit) and drawing the burden of deceit upon his back, so that in following them he too can earn the curses of the A'immah if he cannot earn their supplications.

Chapter one

The Ahl al-Sunnah are in conformity with the Qur'ān

The beliefs and teachings of the Ahl al-Sunnah are in conformity with the *Thaqalayn* (i.e. the Qur'ān and Sunnah of Rasūlullāh ﷺ) whereas the beliefs and teachings of the Shīʿah faith opposes the Qur'ān and Sunnah of Rasūlullāh ﷺ. The number of statements which the A'immah made disparaging and demeaning the scholars of the Shīʿah are such that it is impossible to list them all in this concise treatise but as a way of example a few will have to be mentioned, which will be easily understood by the level-headed. After discussing these examples, we will continue with refuting the letter (of the Shīʿī scholar ʿAmmār ʿAlī). Allah Taʿālā mentions in the first chapter of the Qur'ān:

اَلَّذِیْنَ اٰتَیْنٰهُمُ الْكِتٰبَ یَتْلُوْنَهٗ حَقَّ تِلَاوَتِهٖ ؕ اُولٰٓئِكَ یُؤْمِنُوْنَ بِهٖ ؕ وَمَنْ یَّكْفُرْ بِهٖ فَاُولٰٓئِكَ هُمُ الْخٰسِرُوْنَ ﴿۱۲۱﴾

> Those to whom We have given the Book and recite it as it should be recited, they are the ones who believe in it. Whoever denies it shall certainly be the losers.[1]

After studying the implication of this verse there is no possibility for any person to ever doubt the Ahl al-Sunnah being on the truth, and once he has no doubt then he has attained the first stage of conviction that the Shīʿah are on falsehood.

The implication of the verse

To elaborate upon the assertion made above, this verse was revealed regarding a few of the Ahl al-Kitāb and even though revealed regarding them, it has made īmān dependent on bringing faith in the Book of Allah: "Recite it as it should be recited, they are the ones who believe in it." When this is the prerequisite for

1 Sūrah al-Baqarah: 121

īmān, we learn that the sign of īmān is that one recites it abundantly, whichever Book of Allah it might be: Torah, Injīl or Qur'ān. An example of this is if an intelligent person understands something properly and quickly, and another then remarks: "This can only be understood by the intelligent." Even though this praise was specifically for that person, in reality it will also be praise for every other intelligent person who understands that point in the same manner. Thus, this quality (even though it was directed to the Ahl al-Kitāb will testify to the īmān of all those who possess it and it) can only be found in the Ahl al-Sunnah and none of the other sects of Islam. The recitation of the Shīʿah is something well-known to all.

The Shīʿah deprivation of reciting the Qur'ān

In fact, their recitation of the Qur'ān is so well-known that they have become parables of failing to learn the Qur'ān. This can only mean that they are unable to recite the Qur'ān as it should be recited and they have failed to make that effort upon the Book of Allah which is required. As far as the Ahl al-Sunnah are concerned and reciting the Qur'ān as it should be recited; what need be said, their repeated recitation is such that chapters are memorised.

This verse also suggests that amongst the various sects of Islam, the sect on the truth will be the one which memorizes the Qur'ān and the others will be unable to do so because if they were able to then it would necessitate them also being included in this praise despite them being on falsehood. Nevertheless, this bounty has been granted to the Ahl al-Sunnah and all of the other sects have been deprived of it, such that up to this day you have never heard of any other sect having memorised the Qur'ān, whether they be Khawārij or Shīʿah (I mention these two only because there are no other sects in India but them). After the Ahl al-Sunnah, the Shīʿah are more in number such that there is rarely a village or town where they cannot be found. Not to mention Lakhnow, suburbs of Dakan and districts of Sindh; where in addition to being the majority, authority is also in their hands. Thousands of Shīʿah ʿulamā reside therein and it is from here that Shī'asm has spread throughout India, yet you will not find a single ḥāfiẓ amongst

them. If any of them happened to have been accused of being a ḥāfiẓ by the Shīʿah then he replies that he had memorised it but his memory has gotten a little weak and he cannot recite at the moment. If he does recite then he recites one or two chapters and not that he recites the entire Qur'ān, beginning to end.

Amongst the acclaimed *ḥuffāẓ* (plural of ḥafiẓ) of the Shīʿah is Jaʿfar ʿAlī, the senior imām of Delhi, whose piety, taqwā, knowledge and excellence, if failing him to earn the title of Mujtahid al-Zamān (Mujtahid of the era) most definitely earns him the title of a Mujtahid. What was the level of his recitation of the Qur'ān before his illness? I have witnessed this with my very own eyes, along with the other attendees of the Shīʿah faith, when he would recite in the qirā'ah gatherings of Nawāb Ḥāmid ʿAlī Khan; he would recite while gazing into the Qur'ān and then too he erred twice. Now see the manner in which Allah Taʿālā reveals the truth: in the same gathering there were ḥuffāẓ of the Ahl al-Sunnah, who were forced by the Shīʿah to also recite the Qur'ān and when they did, they recited from memory. Yet the Shīʿah still fail to take lesson.

Ḥāfiẓ ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz, a Sunnī who resides in Najībabād, informed me that he used to study a few books under Jaʿfar ʿAlī. One day it just so happened that the book mentioned: "The Shīʿah cannot memorise the Qur'ān." On hearing this Jaʿfar ʿAlī asked him whether he would listen to him recite. Ḥāfiẓ ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz replied:

> What difficulty is there in reciting it in two sittings or perhaps if asked to recite as much as you can in one gathering.

However, Jaʿfar ʿAlī replied:

> Can we not rather arrange for one *juz'* (chapter) to be recited daily?

It should be borne in mind that some gifted individuals are able to memorise an entire juz' of the Qur'ān in one day from scratch. What kind of a ḥāfiẓ is there who has not recited the entire Qur'ān in one sitting? And I know that Jaʿfar ʿAlī is unable to recite even one juz' in one sitting. This was but an empty promise.

Ḥāfiẓ ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz thought that this was a ruse and that he would memorise the chapters to be recited each day, which would prove my claim to be false or perhaps he might have memorised a few chapters, which he will recite and then escape from reciting the rest with some flimsy excuse or the other.

It should be noted by all that he did not memorise the Qur'ān and to award him the title of ḥāfiẓ is absolutely incorrect. If by chance one or two have memorised the Qur'ān then this too is sufficient to break the pride of the Shīʿah as it is common knowledge that in the cities and villages of the Ahl al-Sunnah hundreds of ḥuffāz can be found. At times the number of Ahl al-Sunnah residing in a village is the same as the Shīʿah yet amongst the Shīʿah you will not find even a single ḥāfiẓ whereas in the same village amongst the Ahl al-Sunnah countless ḥuffāẓ can be found. In areas such as Sahāranpur, Pānipat and Karānah this is the state of affairs. The reason for this failure to memorise the Qur'ān (whereas the Shīʿah often boastfully claim that never mind the Qur'ān, the Shīʿah memorise the entire *Tafsīr al-Kabīr* as well) is that they are not of those who recite the Qur'ān as it should be recited.

Why are the Shīʿah deprived of reciting the Qur'ān

The reason for this failure to recite the Qur'ān, and Allah knows best, could be a result of the differences in the tastes of man. Just as the preferences of man differ from one to the other as far as food and nourishment is concerned; some having a taste for sweet while others have a greater inclination to bitter foods and that which is relished by some might be abhorred by others. Some dislike the smell of perfumes and spicy pickles with the mere smell of it let alone giving them a headache might render them ill. Worms on the other hand revel in the sight of faeces and other filth, whereas the smell of perfume does not attract them. In a similar manner, tastes and preferences differ with regards to the nourishment of the soul. Likes and dislikes vary, what brings pleasure to one causes discomfort to the other and to the Shīʿah any effort upon the Noble Qur'ān is tantamount to death for them.

Or perhaps the reason for this deprivation is that whichever student is disrespectful towards his teacher, it is the practice of Allah that such a student will be deprived of knowledge. The reason for this is perhaps that just as gratitude leads to an increase in bounty:

لَئِنْ شَكَرْتُمْ لَأَزِيْدَنَّكُمْ

> If you show gratitude, I will increase my bounty upon you.

Ingratitude leads to the bounty being rescinded. In addition to this Rasūlullāh ﷺ has said:

من لم يشكر الناس لم يشكر الله

> Whoever does not express his gratitude towards people has not expressed his gratitude to Allah.

The bounty of knowledge is attained through the intermediary of a teacher and the teachers of the greatest bounty- the Noble Qur’ān, were none other than the illustrious Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم, amongst whom Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه and Sayyidunā ʿUthmān رضي الله عنه were the compilers of the Qur’ān. Why then should a person not be deprived of the knowledge of the Qur’ān on account of him showing disrespect towards them?

True īmān is found in those who recite the Qur’ān appropriately

Just as the point above becomes apparent from the verse recited, so too do we learn that true īmān is reserved for those people who recite the Qur’ān in abundance as it should be recited. Those who are deficient in their recital of the Noble Qur’ān or practice upon it according to their own personal understanding or even those who adhere to its teachings but recite it little — or not at all — are not in included. The reason for this restriction in favour of those who recite the Qur’ān as it should be, is primarily because whoever will read a book repeatedly

will understand it best and he will understand its true reality. Īmān in the book of Allah means that one considers its laws and directives to be the truth. Whoever will follow them- those who recite the Qur'ān as it should be recited and as a result have understood its true meaning, they too will not be deprived of true īmān and will not be included amongst the sect referred to by the words:

> Whoever denies it shall certainly be the losers.

Undoubtedly those who are deficient in their recitation and do not adhere to its teachings or intend to practice upon it according to their own interpretations; such people are often deluded by the laws of the British, which contains no subtleties, so what will they understand of the Qur'ān which is a treasury of all knowledge and filled with subtleties? Such people who say one thing about the Qur'ān when the Qur'ān says something entirely different, they have disbelieved in the Qur'ān despite their claims of bringing īmān in it. They are those who are referred to by the words of Allah:

> Whoever denies it shall certainly be the losers.

The following verse also refers to them:

يُضِلُّ بِهٖ كَثِيْرًا

> Allah Taʿālā leads many astray by (them misinterpreting) this Qur'ān.

The reason for revelation supports this deduction

Supporting this deduction, aside from it being apparent, is that this verse was revealed in favour of those who recited the Book of Allah in abundance and as a result memorised the qualities of Rasūlullāh ﷺ that were mentioned in that Book, allowing every angle and aspect of it to become apparent to them. This resulted in them recognising Rasūlullāh ﷺ as soon as they saw him. However, there is difference of opinion whether the Book referred to here is the Torah or the Injīl and whether it refers to the Christians or the Jews.

The majority will be considered

It is apparent to those of knowledge that the entire Ahl al-Sunnah is considered to be one and the entire Shīʿah sect for that matter as well. Collectively the Ahl al-Sunnah should be considered and collectively the Shīʿah should be considered, and then it should be seen which of the two groups collectively recites the Qur'ān abundantly, as it should be recited. When scrutinising any group collectively then one ruling will apply to the entire group, if it is little then it is for all and if it is abundant then too it will apply to all. This is akin to the arms, legs and other limbs of the body, whereby the actions of one will be attributed to the entire body, i.e. the person himself. If he has some ailment in his hand then he will say: "I have an ailment" or "A certain person has an ailment." Similarly he says I saw, he saw, I hit, he hit, in all these cases the action of a part of the body is attributed to the person himself and not that part only. This is the rule of "Majority is equal to entirely" and is accepted by all, whereby the action or quality of the majority will be taken to be that of all. With this in mind, it is noted that the majority of the Ahl al-Sunnah wa l-Jamā'ah recite the Qur'ān abundantly as opposed to the Shīʿah whose state of recitation is known.

The Shīʿah defence

It is possible that the Shīʿah might attempt to save face by claiming that according to them, reciting the Qur'ān as it should be recited means to recite it with concentration and deliberation; and what proof do you have that this is found amongst the Ahl al-Sunnah but not amongst the Shīʿah? Thus the Shīʿah too are included in the above verse.

As far as concentration and deliberation is concerned we do not deny its necessity, because concentration and deliberation is attained either by firm belief upon the Qur'ān or abundant recitation. The manner in which firm belief will lead to deeper concentration and deliberation is evident and requires no further explanation. As far as abundant recitation is concerned: the majority of man are negligent of Allah Taʿālā and more inclined to the world, in such a

case a moment or two of dhikr or recitation of the Qur'ān will not remove this negligence. However, if he spends hours upon hours, over a long period of time, it will create the light of attentiveness in his heart. This is when concentration and deliberation is attained. However, these differences can only be understood by those who perform dhikr and recite the Qur'ān; it is uncertain whether the Shīʿah will be able to understand it.

The Ahl al-Sunnah have firm belief in the Qur'ān

I mentioned that firm belief is a means of attaining concentration and deliberation or it is abundant recitation, rather it is that both together attain concentration and deliberation upon the Qur'ān. One can only imagine the firmness of belief those who refer to the Qur'ān as being the pages of ʿUthmān must possess (i.e. the Shīʿah) whereas the Ahl al-Sunnah regard the Qur'ān to be the exact word of Allah, without any alterations, additions or subtractions. Much can be said but the Arabic proverb will be most apt here:

الاناء يترشح بما فيه

Only that which is contained in a vessel will flow forth.

Studying the conditions of the Ahl al-Sunnah and the Shīʿah will allow us to determine which of the two have a firmer belief in the Qur'ān. The condition of the Ahl al-Sunnah is well-known: they regard the Qur'ān as a part of one's life. While the Shīʿah may keep the Qur'ān in their bags or in their homes, the Ahl al-Sunnah keep it in their hearts. This is the reason why the Ahl al-Sunnah give the greatest preference to the teaching of the Qur'ān over all else. Children are first taught to recite the Qur'ān and they are made to even memorise portions of it. Nothing overrules the Qur'ān such that even ḥadīth is only considered, if found to be in harmony with the Qur'ān. If a contradiction is found then the blame rests upon the shoulders of the narrators as it is evident that they have erred in some way or the other. As for the Shīʿah, their disregard for the Qur'ān is such that Al-Kulaynī reported in his book- *Al-Kāfī*, (which is considered by them to be the most

authentic book on ḥadīth) such narrations regarding the Qur'ān that if a person were to read them then he would discard the Qur'ān altogether.

The belief of the Shīʿah regarding the Qur'ān

According to them, the Qur'ān has been altered in the same way as the Torah and Injīl were altered if not worse, such that they have replaced referring to the Qur'ān as the Word of Allah with the term "Pages of ʿUthmān" and without verbally saying it, they believe that from the *Thaqalayn* (the two weighty things which Rasūlullāh صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ had left behind for the guidance of the ummah) they are unable to derive benefit from the Qur'ān. It is evident that the Qur'ān has no weight in the eyes of the Shīʿah because if this were not true then what would the meaning of Shīʿah statements such as these be:

> Reciting the Qur'ān is no less than smoking a pipe.

Nevertheless, the majority of the Shīʿah bear testimony to the fact that the Qur'ān has no worth in their eyes and amongst the Ahl al-Sunnah a few might be found, whose proclamations of honour are not complimented with their actions. As far as abundant recitation is concerned, this requires no explanation, as the Shīʿah themselves admit that this virtue belongs to the Ahl al-Sunnah.

Concentration and deliberation belongs to the Ahl al-Sunnah as well

If the Shīʿah were to claim that concentration and deliberation is implied by reciting the Qur'ān as it should be recited then too we will not object as this too belongs to the Ahl al-Sunnah, but what fault is it of ours that the wording of the verse implies abundant recitation? The reason being that the words "as it should be recited" is the *mafʿūl muṭlaq* (adverb) of the verb "Recite" and it is common knowledge that an adverb has to be from amongst the possible categories of that verb. Reciting abundantly is without a doubt of the categories of recitation but concentration and deliberation are not, rather they are external conditions. Recitation is an act of the tongue whereas concentration and deliberation are acts

of the mind. It is also not correct to affix the result: "They are the ones who believe in it" to the statement: "Those who were given the Book" as the appropriateness of the sentence requires that the clause be affixed to the mentioned form of recitation. Those acquainted with the laws of *balāghah* (eloquence of the Arabic language) understand this well. This is also why the verb- "يؤمنون" (believe) is in the future tense and not the past tense.

If concentration and deliberation is implied then the order of occurrence will be switched

If the meaning of reciting the Qur'ān as it should be recited is taken to mean reciting it with concentration and deliberation then the meaning will be switched. The explanation of this is as follows: īmān either means the commonly implied meaning (belief that Allah alone is worthy of worship) or perfect and complete subjugation, referred to as īmān-e kāmil, or *taṣdīq* (confirming) the intended meaning or purpose of Allah Taʿālā. In each of these cases the order of occurrence will be switched.

In the case of the commonly implied meaning, testifying that none is worthy of worship except Allah and Muḥammad ﷺ is the rasūl of Allah is understood by everyone to come before concentration and deliberation, i.e. concentration and deliberation will be dependent on the level of īmān one has and not the other way around that īmān itself is dependent upon concentration and deliberation.

As for īmān having the meaning of īmān-e kāmil, this too precedes concentration and deliberation in recitation because it (īmān) is the cause and concentration, etc is the result. The verse:

اَلَّذِيْنَ اٰمَنُوْا وَتَطْمَئِنُّ قُلُوْبُهُمْ بِذِكْرِ اللّٰهِ ۭ اَلَا بِذِكْرِ اللّٰهِ تَطْمَئِنُّ الْقُلُوْبُ ۝۲۸

> Those who have īmān and whose hearts are contented with the dhikr of Allah. Behold! Hearts are contented with the dhikr of Allah.

Also suggests the same that īmān-e kāmil is the cause of abundant dhikr and the contentment of hearts, as contentment of the heart cannot be attained without *Nafs-e Muṭma’innah*, which is itself a result of īmān-e kāmil, which is manifest.

All that remains is īmān having the meaning of taṣdīq, which is clarified by the verse:

وَ اِذَا سَمِعُوْا مَآ اُنْزِلَ اِلَى الرَّسُوْلِ تَرٰٓى اَعْيُنَهُمْ تَفِيْضُ مِنَ الدَّمْعِ مِمَّا عَرَفُوْا مِنَ الْحَقِّ ۚ يَقُوْلُوْنَ رَبَّنَآ اٰمَنَّا فَاكْتُبْنَا مَعَ الشّٰهِدِيْنَ ﴿٨٣﴾

> When they hear what has been revealed to the Rasūl ﷺ, you see their eyes flowing with tears because they recognise the truth.[1]

The concentration and deliberation referred to by “You see their eyes flowing with tears” in this verse is preceded by īmān because the meaning of this verse is that when these people mentioned above heard the revelation that had descended upon Rasūlullāh ﷺ, you will see their eyes filled with tears on account of them having understood the truth. This makes it clear that after having heard much about the Qur’ān they requested to hear it for themselves and after hearing it, their eyes were filled with tears and their hearts filled with deliberation. It can never be that first they concentrated and cried and thereafter the truth dawned upon them. Thus, if the meaning of “Recite it as it should be recited” is said to mean reciting with concentration and deliberation (and not abundantly) then the order of occurrence will be changed (and the verse will mean that on account of concentration and deliberation they were blessed with īmān whereas one is blessed with concentration and deliberation on account of īmān).

If abundant recitation is implied then the meaning will be correct

If “Recite it as it should be recited” is said to mean abundant recitation then the meaning will be correct in all three instances. Those without īmān or possessing

1 Sūrah al-Mā’idah: 83

weak īmān through abundant recitation will understand the meaning of Allah Taʿālā's word, resulting in them being guided, their doubts removed and granting them true faith, which is the essence of īmān.

If the commonly implied meaning of īmān is implied then abundant recitation will also award one such īmān. If īmān-e kāmil is implied then too one will be awarded it because through abundant recitation, negligence is removed and slowly one attains the required level of attentiveness, purifying his heart even further. As for the meaning of taṣdīq of the intended purpose of Allah then this too is obvious as it is well-known to everybody that a person who reads a book more than others will have greater knowledge of that book.

A doubt regarding the verse

One doubt still remains: the result- "They are the ones who believe in it", is clearly attached to the clause- "Recite it as it should be recited", for a few reasons. Firstly, because of the noun being affixed to the clause and the fact that the verb was in the future tense ("يؤمنون") and not past tense (the verb "امنوا" was not used). But there is one possibility that this could be merely a sign of īmān (that one recites it abundantly) and not a result of īmān, as is the case with the signs of many things that the very sign of it is created from itself. An example of this will be smoke, which is a sign of fire but in itself is created from fire and its existence dependent upon the existence of the fire and not that the fire is dependent upon it. So what is wrong if recitation with consideration and deliberation is said to be a sign of īmān but at the same time it is created from īmān, and in this case Allah Taʿālā only intended to make mention of the sign.

The reply to this will firstly be that to abandon the best interpretation and rely upon such weak interpretations is itself a sign of poor understanding.

This is more so when we are dealing with the Qur'ān, which will only have the best interpretation.

Secondly the purpose of mentioning a sign of something is to make it recognisable and distinguishable, thus if the sign is itself imperceptible and indiscernible then mentioning such a sign is futile, and the speech of Allah Taʿālā can never be futile. Concentration and deliberation are inner qualities which cannot be perceived so in making this a sign of īmān, it would result in describing something vague with something also vague or something imperceptible with something also imperceptible. On the other hand, reciting the Qur’ān abundantly is something perceptible and if this is said to be a sign of īmān then it would make sense and this sign itself necessitates concentration and deliberation, which would make it correct for this to be just a sign, not affecting the meaning, order of occurrence or the adverb.

Another benefit of this verse

After having discussed the possible doubt regarding the interpretation of this verse, I wish to mention another benefit which it gives. It comes to mind that the clause- “Those to whom We have given the Book”, indicates that if any of those who were not given a Book, i.e. they deny it completely or misinterpret it after accepting it, were to become a ḥāfiẓ then it is no problem or one can even say that they may recite similar to the manner in which it should be recited. However, as far as those who were given the Book are concerned, only those who are on the absolute truth will be granted the ability to recite it abundantly. The reason for this is that abundant recitation, which is the manner in which the Qur’ān should be recited, is a sign of īmān. Thus, it will only be seen in those who believe in it entirely and not in everyone. With this in mind, the famous tale of Burnus- the Christian, having memorised the entire Book of Allah will need not be doubted and may be accepted to be possible.

Nevertheless, we learnt from the sign of reciting the Qur’ān as it should be recited that the glad tidings of “They are the ones who believe in it” is for the Ahl al-Sunnah and the Shīʿah are described by:

> Whoever denies it shall certainly be the losers.

Many verses of the Qur'ān prove the Ahl al-Sunnah are on the truth

There are numerous verses of the Qur'ān which prove the Ahl al-Sunnah are on truth and the Shīʿah on falsehood, and why should it not; when the majority of Shīʿī beliefs oppose the Qur'ān. The beliefs and practices of the Ahl al-Sunnah however are in complete conformity with the Qur'ān. The reason for this is that through abundant recitation they have understood the intention of Allah Taʿālā, whereas the Shīʿah on account of not fulfilling the right of the Qur'ān have been deprived of its understanding. Since this has all been proven from the verse of the Qur'ān, those with intellect will understand that the verses of the Qur'ān will oppose the religion of the Shīʿah and the Ahl al-Sunnah will conform to the Qur'ān. In fact, not just a few but the majority of the Qur'ān refutes the beliefs, practices and customs of the Shīʿah and bears testimony to the veracity of the Ahl al-Sunnah wa l-Jamā'ah. How is it possible to explain all of these verses in this brief treatise, especially when each of these verses refutes the Shīʿah and affirms the belief of the Ahl al-Sunnah.

However, this one verse is capable of representing all of the other verses which is why I will suffice with it. It is possible that an obstinate Shīʿah might object to this verse when understanding the guidance it contains and say: "So what if the Qur'ān contains this one verse, it is but one. What credibility does the Qur'ān have, it makes no difference if it opposes our beliefs. The words of the Qur'ān have been altered and changed, additions and subtractions carried out, so it is not far-fetched to believe that this too was added by the Ahl al-Sunnah."

If they were to make such a claim then the reply would first be that according to the research scholars of the Shīʿah either no additions or subtractions were made to the Qur'ān, as is the believe of Shaykh al-Ṣadūq, or subtractions have occurred but no additions. Thus the Qur'ān having no additions is a matter of consensus and the verse under discussion cannot be refuted. However, since both these standpoints of the Shīʿah oppose the narrations of *Al-Kāfī*, which is considered to be the most reliable book by them, and the majority of Shīʿah believe that additions and subtractions both occurred in the Qur'ān; this reply will be insufficient.

The second reply will be that this doubt itself is proof of the falsehood of the Shīʿah faith. By the testimony of the Shīʿah themselves we have learnt that the Shīʿah religion has no credibility because the first source of the laws of dīn is the Qur’ān and when they have no reliance upon it, whichever aspects of their faith they manage to somehow prove from the Qur’ān, it will not be accepted.

The foolishness of not relying on the Qur’ān

The Thaqalayn, which is accepted by both groups, bears testimony that the Qur’ān and ʿItrah will always remain to grasp onto and save one from deviation. So accordingly if one cannot grasp onto the Qur’ān then one cannot be saved from deviation and he has been cast far astray. Thus, for the Shīʿah to present such an argument is tantamount to shooting himself in the foot.

There is no ḥadīth in any of the sects of Islam that has reached the same level of authenticity as the Qur’ān and there is no ḥadīth regarding which the narrators are all in consensus regarding its wording as they are regarding the Qur’ān. Furthermore, when one studies the conditions of the narrators of the Shīʿah then he discovers new levels of unreliability. In summary, if any Shīʿah were to present this as a counter argument, which they do most often, then we too have much to say in return.

This proves my point

The confession of the Shīʿah themselves has proved the claim I made under the commentary of the verse, because when they have such a lack of reliance upon the Qur’ān, claiming such phenomenal changes to have been enacted in it, that the Qur’ān as we know it no longer remains the Qur’ān. So now if a Shīʿah were to memorise it or even recite it as it should be, he has not truly recited the Qur’ān or memorised it.

The practice of the Ahl al-Bayt negates any changes having occurred in the Qur'ān

All the narrations of the Shīʿah mention that the Ahl al-Bayt recited this very same Qur'ān, substantiated from it and cited its verses as proofs. They would also make commentaries on the verses of this very same Qur'ān. The commentary on the Qur'ān which has been ascribed to Ḥasan al-ʿAskarī is a commentary of the same. The Ahl al-Bayt taught this Qur'ān to others, their children and their servants and it was this same Qur'ān that they recited in their ṣalāh.

The lengths to which it has been narrated and circulated is proof of its authenticity

In addition to this, imparting this Qur'ān as it has been revealed and teaching it is compulsory upon the ummah of Rasūlullāh ﷺ and there is consensus on this. We know for a fact that whenever any person embraced Islam in the life time of Rasūlullāh ﷺ, he was first taught the Qur'ān after which he would then teach it to others. In this manner, thousands learnt the Qur'ān directly from Rasūlullāh ﷺ and in some battles up to seventy ḥuffāẓ would be martyred. To this very day, even in the villages, recitation of the Qur'ān is regarded as one of the greatest acts of worship, with people remaining engaged in its recitation night and day, in ṣalāh and out. When a child enters the Madrassah, the first thing he is taught is how to recite the Qur'ān. In short, the Qur'ān is not the same as the *Al-Kāfī* of Al-Kulaynī or *Al-Tahdhīb* which was narrated through *taqīyah* (dissimulation) and hidden away for centuries in some box. The Qur'ān is available in abundance with thousands of copies easily at hand, as opposed to *Al-Kāfī* or *Al-Tahdhīb*, for which a search needs to be carried out in order to obtain a copy. Then too, even amongst the Shīʿah, what will every Shīʿah do with a copy of *Al-Kāfī* or *Al-Tahdhīb*, and not everyone is capable of understanding it as well. India and Iran aside, in other countries the name of *Al-Kāfī* or *Al-Tahdhīb* is not even known. If perchance you were to come across one or two copies then they would be riddled with errors. The case is different with the Noble Qur'ān, it can be found in every country, city, town and village, such that no other book

is available in such abundance. Every person has his own copy, with some homes having numerous copies. Such care has been taken that millions of ḥuffāẓ have memorised it and even the verses, letters, diacritical marks and dots have been counted and recorded. Does it make sense to any sane person to believe that *Al-Kāfī* or *Al-Tahdhīb* of the Shīʿah is free from alteration, such that they regard it to be the most authentic book, whereas the Qur'ān is regarded to be tampered with and is claimed to no longer be reliable?

The wide availability of the Qur'ān clears ʿUthmān from all accusations

The era in which the Qur'ān could have been possibly altered, such is the Shīʿah accusation against ʿUthmān رضي الله عنه; alteration could have been done in one or two copies and in no way could every single copy be seized from each Muslim residing in Syria, Persia, Yemen and Ḥijāz. All these countries came under the banner of Islam and its populace regarded the Qur'ān as their means of salvation, reciting it night and day. In no way could all of these copies be seized and altered. These copies were written by ḥuffāẓ: did Uthmān alter the Qur'ān in their hearts as well, such that it resulted in only altered copies coming into circulation? Considering all of this, no sane person will ever claim that the Qur'ān has been altered. When the Qur'ān is free from any change, addition or subtraction, when the commentary of Ḥasan al-ʿAskarī is of the same Qur'ān, then substantiating from the following verses will be absolutely correct:

> Those to whom We have given the Book and recite it as it should be recited, they are the ones who believe in it. Whoever denies it shall certainly be the losers.

Certificate of authenticity from the Qur'ān itself

If this is further supported by the Qur'ān itself, then without a doubt the substantiation made will be correct and it will be compulsory to accept. When we searched through the Qur'ān, we found numerous verses testifying to the fact that the Qur'ān is as it was revealed with not a single change or variation. Its

words are as they were revealed without any substitution. I think it necessary to only mention one of these verses:

اِنَّا نَحْنُ نَزَّلْنَا الذِّكْرَ وَ اِنَّا لَهٗ لَحٰفِظُوْنَ ﴿٩﴾

> Without doubt only We have revealed the Reminder and We shall certainly be its protectors.[1]

Ponder over its meaning, the emphasis laid upon its protection; it is impossible to fathom that the third khalīfah- ʿUthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, has altered it such that there remains absolutely no trace of the original Qur'ān. Despite the immense power of Allah, he still managed to thwart the power of Allah, Allah forbid.

The results of this incorrect belief

As for the assumption that Allah Taʿālā made a promise and then broke it, this is utterly impossible. It is impossible that Allah Taʿālā would make a promise with such emphasis and then go back on His word and not protect the Qur'ān. Allah says in the Qur'ān:

اِنَّ اللّٰهَ لَا يُخْلِفُ الْمِيْعَادَ ﴿٩﴾

> Allah Taʿālā does not break His promises.[2]

Perhaps the Shīʿah assume that the era in which ʿUthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ altered the Qur'ān or whoever did it, Allah Taʿālā was asleep or maybe forgot his promise? The reply to this was given in the Qur'ān as well, Āyat al-Kursī is recited by the Shīʿah as well, Allah says:

لَا تَاْخُذُهٗ سِنَةٌ وَّلَا نَوْمٌ

> Neither does sleep nor drowsiness overcome him.[3]

---

1 Sūrah al-Ḥijr: 9

2 Sūrah Āl ʿImrān: 9

3 Sūrah al-Baqarah: 255

Allah says in Sūrah Maryam:

وَمَا كَانَ رَبُّكَ نَسِيًّا ﴿٦٤﴾

Your Rabb does not forget.[1]

In Sūrah Tāhā, Allah says:

لَا يَضِلُّ رَبِّىْ وَ لَا يَنْسَى

My Rabb does not err nor does he forget.[2]

These verses remove all possibilities of Allah Taʿālā promising to protect the Qur’ān and then erring in doing so, or in error began protecting something else. When all of these are impossible, this humble servant of the house of Rasūlullāh ﷺ wishes to ask the Shīʿah; after this firm promise and nothing to impede its fulfilment, why then did Allah Taʿālā not protect the Qur’ān? The only possibility then is that according to you, Sayyidunā ʿUthmān رضي الله عنه has more power and authority than Allah Taʿālā (I seek Allah’s protection from having to utter such statements) that Allah Taʿālā was prevented from fulfilling his desire. This means that you have such high consideration for Sayyidunā ʿUthmān رضي الله عنه that you consider him even superior to Allah, should you then not side with him? (Allah forbid) If this is your belief than what protection can you hope for on the Day of Qiyāmah, ʿUthmān رضي الله عنه will just seize you all from beneath the ʿArsh of Allah and begin punishing you.

The falsehood of Al-Kulaynī

The only other option you have is to say that your belief is incorrect and that the narrations of Al-Kulaynī are all lies and fabrications.

1 Sūrah Maryam: 64

2 Sūrah Ṭāhā: 52

عن هشام بن سالم عی ابی عبد الله ان القران الذی جاء به جبرئیل الی محمد صلی الله علیه و سلم سبعة عشر الف ایات

The Qur'ān with which Jibra'īl ﷺ came to Muḥammad ﷺ contained seventeen thousand verses.[1]

The present Qur'ān in our possession consists of approximately six thousand verses but according to this Shīʿah narration, two thirds of the Qur'ān is missing. It would have been better if Allah Taʿālā had not made any promise to protect the Qur'ān as it was on account of this promise that Rasūlullāh ﷺ had no concern about the Qur'ān ever being altered. Perhaps if it had not been made then steps could have been taken to preserve it. Those who have studied the Torah and Injīl, they too have not claimed it being altered in this manner. In fact after research it was found that the alterations in the Torah and Injīl were not many, wherever they saw something supporting the claim of the Muslims they removed it and wherever there was a law causing difficulty to their leaders they would alter it, and Allah knows best the true reality. All the same, the gist of the Shīʿah ideology is that despite the promise of Allah Taʿālā to protect the Qur'ān, the Qur'ān was not preserved and it has more changes and faults in it than even the Torah and Injīl, whereas these Books had no protector, neither Allah, nor a rasūl. Yes, their materialistic scholars were present, whose occupation it was to sell the verses of Allah and alter the laws of Allah. They only taught and listened to it, knew its laws and expounded it; they were never its protectors or guardians. Perhaps this is what the Shīʿah sect implies when they say the Qur'ān is worse than the Torah and Injīl; that in unreliability the Shīʿah surpass the ʿulamā of the previous nations.

Shīʿah interpretation of the Qur'ān being safe-guarded

The scholars of the Shīʿah provide two explanations to Allah having taken responsibility of protecting the Qur'ān:

1 *Al-Kāfī*

1. It is protected in the *Lowḥ al-Maḥfūẓ* (Divine Tablet in the heavens).
2. It is protected by the Imām in the cave- *Surra man Ra'ā*.

In the first case, the answer is obvious. Firstly if:

> We shall certainly be its protectors.

refers to the Lowḥ al-Maḥfūẓ then how does this assist us. What is the meaning of this promise? What would benefit us is a promise to protect this Qur'ān which is in our possession, so that there will remain no doubt in deriving the laws of Allah Taʿālā from it.

Secondly, what need is there to safeguard it in the Lowḥ al-Maḥfūẓ? Yes, if it were possible for some trouble-maker to reach the heavens than it would most definitely need safe-guarding.

Thirdly, this verse first mentions its revelation (to the world) and thereafter the promise of protection is made, the eloquence of which dictates that the promise of protection is directed towards this revealed Qur'ān and not the Qur'ān which is already safe in the Lowḥ al-Maḥfūẓ.

Fourthly, if this is truly the meaning, that it has been safeguarded in the Lowḥ al-Maḥfūẓ, then this virtue is shared by the Torah and Injīl as well; what supremacy will the Qur'ān then have over the Torah and Injīl? Also, why then was the promise of protection made for the Qur'ān and not for the Torah and Injīl? What meaning will this have?

Fifthly, this verse refers to the Qur'ān, from its many names, by the name "Reminder" (i.e dhikr), and did not say the words of the Qur'ān (that We have revealed the words of the Qur'ān) or "Book" (that We have revealed the Book), etc, so that there remain no room to ever consider that it has been altered, changed, added to or subtracted from.

The wisdom behind referring to the Qur'ān by the name "Reminder"

The point mentioned above requires some explanation, which makes it incumbent upon us to do so in order for the correct meaning to be understood. First one needs to understand that one item may have various names based upon its diverse uses, qualities and composition and each name will only be used in the most appropriate context and not mentioned arbitrarily. An example of this would be the manner in which one person may be a father, while at the same time he is someone's son. Similarly he is a brother, nephew, uncle and a grandson. In essence one person may have different titles and each of them will not be used randomly but rather they will be used in context. A son will not address his father as son even though he is the son of another and similarly the father will not address his son as father, even though he may be a father to his own children.

A second example of this would be a governor, who may also be the treasurer and the magistrate. However, since the tasks of each of these posts are different, when he performs a task as governor then he will refer to himself as such, when carrying out a task as treasurer then he will refer to himself as the treasurer and as the magistrate when performing the duty of the magistrate.

In the same manner the Qur'ān has many names and titles, each of them on account of a different quality and different perspective. For example the Qur'ān is called the Qur'ān because *qirā'ah* (recitation) is made of it, it is called a *Kitāb* (Book) or *Mushaf* (Manuscript) on account of it being written on pages. Similarly it is called *Dhikr* (Reminder) because it is a reminder for the ignorant, negligent and sinner. Therefore the usage of this title- "Reminder", will only be correct when directed towards the ignorant, negligent and sinful. It is common knowledge that if any creation possesses these qualities then it is man, since the angels are free from such deficiencies. Therefore as long as the Qur'ān was only present in the Lowḥ al-Maḥfūẓ, it was incorrect to refer to the Qur'ān by this name as there were no ignorant, negligent or sinful creation present. If any creation was present at that time, it was only the angels. However, once revelation of the Qur'ān began and it now came into the hands of man then it was correct to refer to the Qur'ān

as "Dhikr" because the purpose of its revelation was to advise and remind the negligent. When Allah then said:

> We shall certainly be its protectors.

The personal pronoun (its) will refer to Dhikr (the Reminder), which would necessitate its protection being undertaken at the time it was given this name (Dhikr), which is only after revelation.

Negating the second Shīʿah interpretation

As far as the second interpretation is concerned (that the Qur'ān has been safeguarded with the alleged Imām al-Mahdī in the cave Surra man Ra'ā), firstly the entire legend of Imām al-Mahdī taking refuge in a cave is a fairy tale. When the Qur'ān has been deemed unreliable, despite the infinite number of narrators reporting it, then what reliability can be placed on a narration reported by a few deceitful individuals, especially when it is utterly illogical. No sane person will believe in such nonsense. In addition, those narrations which mention this fairy tale, do so in such a way that it makes it extremely difficult to believe that 'Imām al-Mahdī' had even memorised the Qur'ān.

This duty belongs to the Ahl al-Sunnah, if you accept that Imām al-Mahdī has a similitude to the Ahl al-Sunnah, then based upon the narration:

من تشبه بقوم فهو منهم

> Whoever bears a similarity to a nation is of that nation.

Yes, it is possible then, that he has memorised the Qur'ān.

Imām al-Mahdī concealing the Qur'ān in this manner so that it may not fall under the gaze of the followers of the third khalīfah Sayyidunā ʿUthmān رضي الله عنه, may be considered reasonable but then we ask those of understanding as to how this is different from the first interpretation as then it will be preserved in the cave Surra

man Ra'ā in the same way as it is preserved in the Lowḥ al-Maḥfūẓ. In that case, according to the fifth point mentioned above, this (Imām al-Mahdī preserving the Qur'ān in the cave as the Shīʿah believe) will not fulfil the promise of safe-guarding the Qur'ān. It will only be deemed correct to refer to the Qur'ān as a "Reminder" when the Ummah reads and teaches it. Who goes to the cave Surra man Ra'ā, who derives benefit from it? If there is a promise to protect the Qur'ān then it is to protect this Qur'ān before us, while it is in our midst. Furthermore, if the Qur'ān of Imām al-Mahdī is in accordance with this Qur'ān then only is it the true Qur'ān otherwise the Qur'ān of the 'Imām' himself will be a forgery. In essence, ascribing such nonsense to Allah Taʿālā is an attempt to undermine the teachings of Islam.

It is indeed foolish to believe that Allah Taʿālā promised to protect the Qur'ān so that the ummah of Nabī Muḥammad ﷺ would have no difficulty in determining the laws of Sharīʿah tomorrow and keep the flame of Islam burning until the Day of Qiyāmah but then, unfortunately, this plan was thwarted (Allah forbid). The implication of this claim that the Qur'ān is safe-guarded in the cave Surra man Ra'ā is that Allah Taʿālā could not foresee this. Imagine what this would lead a non-Muslim to think about Islam.

This opens the doors of assault on Islam

We hope that no Shīʿah will ever mention this belief to any Jew or Christian, if they mention it to us then we would keep it silent to save ourselves from disgrace. However, if the Jews were to be the first to hear such a thing then they would be able to say that there Torah has also been preserved in the Lowḥ al-Maḥfūẓ.

Apart from this, the verse of Sūrah al-Aḥqāf informs us that the Jinn had the actual Torah in their possession and they did not alter it like man because then they would not have said:

قَالُوْا يٰقَوْمَنَآ اِنَّا سَمِعْنَا كِتٰبًا اُنْزِلَ مِنْۢ بَعْدِ مُوْسٰى مُصَدِّقًا لِّمَا بَيْنَ يَدَيْهِ يَهْدِیْٓ اِلَى الْحَقِّ وَ اِلٰى طَرِيْقٍ مُّسْتَقِيْمٍ ﴿۳۰﴾

> They (the Jinn) said: "O our people! We have heard a book that was revealed after Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام which confirms what was before it and guides towards the truth and towards the straight path.[1]

The conviction they had of the Qur'ān affirming what was said in the Torah could have only been attained if they had the actual Torah in their possession or if the Qur'ān was affirming what the forged Torah contained. The second possibility (that the Qur'ān was affirming what the forged Torah contained) is considered incorrect by the Shīʿah as well because the recitation the Jinn heard was directly from Rasūlullāh صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and not from Sayyidunā ʿUthmān رَضِيَ ٱللَّٰهُ عَنْهُ or any other.

However, if they do not fear criticism of the Jews and consider a portion of the Torah to still be authentic, believing only that portion has not been altered, just as the Shīʿah believe that only Sūrah al-Fātiḥah and Sūrah al-Ikhlās have not been altered, and then boastfully say that our Qur'ān is preserved in the cave- Surra man Ra'ā, where is your Torah preserved, or they consider the possibility that the Jinn only heard those verses of the Qur'ān which corresponds with that portion of the Torah that is authentic, and it is only on account of this correspondence that the Jinn deemed the Qur'ān to be affirming what the Torah contains; then only can the Torah be altered as well and the Qur'ān preserved in the cave- Surra man Ra'ā, which makes it superior to the Torah. In such a case they will not have to bow their heads in shame before the Jews but still even this little form of superiority will be hard to prove.

If the Jews overlook this, the Christians will not

Even if they are victorious over the Jews in this argument, how will they face the Christians because Nabī ʿĪsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام — the ḥāfiẓ of the Injīl — is alive in the heavens (both Shīʿah and Sunnī agree on this). The Imām in the cave still has to fear that the followers of Sayyidunā ʿUthmān رَضِيَ ٱللَّٰهُ عَنْهُ might chance upon his hiding place and steal the Qur'ān from him or Allah forbid, even murder him. This will threaten his

1 Sūrah al-Aḥqāf: 30

entire reason for concealment. Nabī ʿĪsā عَلَيْهِ ٱلسَّلَامُ on the other hand is living in the fourth heaven with absolutely no worry whatsoever.

The only possibility whereby the Shīʿah will be able to retain supremacy will be by them telling the Christians that firstly it is not proven that Nabī ʿĪsā عَلَيْهِ ٱلسَّلَامُ was a ḥāfiẓ of the Injīl (even though the same can be said regarding the Imām or even more so since the Injīl was revealed to Nabī ʿĪsā عَلَيْهِ ٱلسَّلَامُ and it would be far-fetched to then believe that he was not a ḥāfiẓ of it, as opposed to the Imām, who was not the one it was directly revealed to. In addition, memorising the Qur'ān makes him similar to the Ahl al-Sunnah whereas there is no similarity in memorising the Injīl) and secondly we also believe that Nabī ʿIsa عَلَيْهِ ٱلسَّلَامُ will descend into the world once again but when he does, his memorisation of the Injīl will be to no avail because it has been abrogated as opposed to the Imām, whose memorisation of the Qur'ān will be of use to him after he makes his appearance. The Shīʿah will finally have the actual Qur'ān in their hands after having to rely on the pages of ʿUthmān رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ all these years, centuries of supplications will finally be accepted.

However, this victory over the Christians will only be possible if the Shīʿah accept our beliefs (that the Qur'ān is unaltered) and they not only distance themselves from beliefs such as the A'immah having the authority to declare what is lawful and what is unlawful, etc but also entirely remove narrations such as these from their books:

> عن محمد بن سنان عن ابى جعفر قال كنت عنده فاجريت اختلاف الشيعة فقال يا محمد ان الله تعالى لم يزل متفردا بالوحدانية ثم خلق محمدا و عليا و فاطمة و الحسن و الحسين فمكثوا الف دهرا فخلق الاشياء و اشهدهم خلقها و اجرى طاعتهم عليها و فوض امرهم اليهم يحلون ما يشاؤن و يحرمون ما يشاؤن
>
> Muḥammad bin Sinān narrates: "I was in the company of Imām al-Bāqir and I asked him about the reason for the many differences amongst the Shīʿah." He replied: "O Muḥammad! Allah Taʿālā was always alone until he created Muḥammad صَلَّى ٱللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, ʿAlī رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ, Fāṭimah رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهَا, Ḥasan رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ and Ḥusayn رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ. He then waited for a thousand years and then created everything else. He gathered all creation before them (these five) and made obeying

> them incumbent on creation and He then handed over authority of the affairs of creation to them. They make lawful whatever they desire and make unlawful whatever they desire."

According to this narration, the differences amongst the Shīʿah is on account of one of the five ruling something to be lawful and another ruling it to be unlawful, with some following one over the other. The second narration is also from Al-Kulaynī, and they need to absolve themselves from it as well.

> عن محمد بن الحسن الميثمی عن ابی عبد الله قال سمعته يقول ان الله ادب رسوله حتى قومه على ما اراد ثم فوض اليه دينه فقال ما اتاكم الرسول فخذوه و ما نهكم عنه فانتهوا فما فوضه الله تعالى الى رسوله فقد فوضه الينا

> Muḥammad bin Ḥasan al-Maythamī narrates that he heard Imām Jaʿfar رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّٰهُ say: "Allah Taʿālā taught his Rasūl صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ etiquette until He straightened him as He so desired. He then handed over the authority of His dīn to him and said:
>
> > Whatever the Rasūl grants you, hold firmly to it and whatever he prohibits you from, abstain from it.
>
> So whatever authority was handed over to Rasūlullāh صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, he handed over to us."

The first narration only mentions the authority being handed over to the five (Rasūlullāh صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, ʿAlī, Fāṭimah, Ḥasan, Ḥusayn رَضِيَ ٱللَّٰهُ عَنْهُمْ) and the second indicates that others also have been granted the same authority, since it refers to the same.

A baseless interpretation to a baseless narration

It is possible that some Shīʿah may claim that the handing over of authority to decree ḥalāl and ḥarām as deemed fit, described in this narration, actually refers to the usage of *ijtihād* (analytical reasoning), which is considered an accepted

practice by the Ahl al-Sunnah as well. So now if the Shīʿah have adopted the ijtihād of these few infallibles what is the issue?

Or they may say: Allah Taʿālā granted them unique abilities and aptitude, with which Allah Taʿālā ordered them to assess things and decree the ruling according to their understanding, so what is the problem?

However, any person of intellect will understand that this interpretation is impossible with the first narration and also it opposes the Shīʿah religion itself to accuse the A'immah of performing such a thing as 'ijtihād', as they consider the decrees of the A'immah to be divine revelation.

As for them being granted unique understanding, we might accept this but the Shīʿah will not; let alone the Ithnā ʿAshariyyah, all the sects of the Shīʿah believe that the A'immah have the authority to change the laws of Sharīʿah. If they were granted unique abilities with which to extract rulings then what is the meaning of changing rulings. The capability should conform to their ability; extract rulings, yes, but why change rulings. Either way these interpretations have no basis.

Even if these replies were to be left aside then too this narration will have no relevance because the Qur'ān states:

تِبْيَانًا لِّكُلِّ شَىْءٍ

> The Qur'ān explains all things.[1]

This means that the Qur'ān explains everything (all laws of Sharīʿah), we might not understand it but it does definitely explain it and others do understand it, especially Rasūlullāh ﷺ. So when the Qur'ān explains everything, what need is there to hand over authority of dīn? All one can do, even the A'immah, is commentate on the Qur'ān but not say a word of your own opinion.

1 Sūrah al-Naḥl: 89

Handing over authority to others abrogates the Qur'ān

Our safety lies in erasing these narrations entirely, then only will we be able to save face before the Jews and Christians. If we fail to do so then they will point fingers at us saying that the Injīl might have been abrogated by the Qur'ān but not all of its laws were abrogated; many aspects pertaining to character as well as prohibitions and permissions were still maintained, and as far as beliefs are concerned then according to the word of the Muslims themselves there is no difference. The same beliefs have continued from Nabī Ādam عَلَيْهِ ٱلسَّلَامُ to this very day. It is mentioned in Sūrah al-Mā'idah:

وَ اَنْزَلْنَآ اِلَيْكَ الْكِتٰبَ بِالْحَقِّ مُصَدِّقًا لِّمَا بَيْنَ يَدَيْهِ مِنَ الْكِتٰبِ

> We have revealed the Book (the Qur'ān) to you with the truth to confirm the Books before it.[1]

Now your Qur'ān is the same as ours because your A'immah changed many laws as they saw fit. The first narration makes this extremely clear as Imām al-Bāqir indicated that this is the reason for the differences amongst the Shīʿah. So even if Imām al-Mahdī does have the actual Qur'ān with him it makes no difference as those laws have been changed. Instead another Qur'ān should be made. If you fail to do so then just as you believe that Nabī ʿĪsā عَلَيْهِ ٱلسَّلَامُ will descend in the last era and despite being a ḥāfiẓ of the Injīl it will not avail him, on account of it being abrogated; so too it is possible that when your Imām finally emerges, intending to practice upon the laws established by Rasūlullāh صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, it will not avail him as it has been abrogated as well.

The laws which the Shīʿah Imām al-Mahdī will enact

As for the possibility of (the Shīʿah) Imām al-Mahdī ruling in accordance with the laws passed by Rasūlullāh صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, this has been refuted by a narration reported by Muḥammad ibn Bābūwayh al-Qummī on the authority of Imām Jaʿfar:

1 Sūrah al-Mā'idah: 48

عن ابى عبد الله انه قال ان الله تعالى اخى بين الارواح فى الازل قبل ان يخلق الاجام بالف عام فاذا قام قائم اهل البيت ورث الاخ من الذين اخا بينهما فى الازل و لم يورث الاخ من الولادة

> Imām Jaʿfar has reported to have said: "Verily Allah Taʿālā created bonds of brotherhood between the souls one thousand years before creating man, When the al-Qā'im (al-Mahdī) of the Ahl al-Bayt will appear, the brother with whom bonds of brotherhood was formed before creation will be the one who inherits and not one who is brother by birth."

This narration clearly indicates that Imām al-Mahdī will not act in accordance with the laws of the Qur'ān and the law that states that a blood brother inherits will be abolished. This narration also informs us that the law of a blood brother inheriting as mentioned in Sūrah al-Nisā is no addition of the khalīfah ʿUthmān رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ but is the direct order of Allah Taʿālā because then why would its nullification be postponed until the emergence of the al-Qā'im?

In short, until the Ithnā ʿAshariyyah do not refute the belief that their Imām al-Mahdī has the authority to abrogate the laws of Sharīʿah, they will not be able to present their case of the Qur'ān being safe-guarded before the Christians as is clear from the verse:

> Without doubt only We have revealed the Reminder and We shall certainly be its protectors.[1]

Affirming the belief of Khatm-e Nubuwwah

The benefit of refuting these beliefs is not only restricted to victory over the Jews and Christians but it corrects and affirms the belief in *Khatm-e Nubuwwah* (Finality of Nubuwwah) mentioned in Sūrah al-Aḥzāb. If they fail to do so then the reproach upon the Jews will be directed to them as well:

اَفَتُؤْمِنُوْنَ بِبَعْضِ الْكِتٰبِ وَتَكْفُرُوْنَ بِبَعْضٍ ۚ

> Do you believe in one portion of the Book and disbelieve in another.[2]

1 Sūrah al-Ḥijr: 9

2 Sūrah al-Baqarah: 85

The reason for this is that even the ambiyā’ were not allowed to abrogate laws of Sharīʿah and prescribe others of their own accord. All of the ambiyā’ of the Banī Isrā’īl, from Nabī Mūsā عَلَيۡهِ ٱلسَّلَامُ until Nabī ʿĪsā عَلَيۡهِ ٱلسَّلَامُ, all acted upon the Torah. In addition, neither Nabī Mūsā عَلَيۡهِ ٱلسَّلَامُ nor Nabī ʿĪsā عَلَيۡهِ ٱلسَّلَامُ were granted the authority to decree the laws of dīn as they saw fit. Whatever they decreed, they did so on the instruction of Allah. Nabī Mūsā عَلَيۡهِ ٱلسَّلَامُ and Nabī ʿĪsā عَلَيۡهِ ٱلسَّلَامُ aside, even Rasūlullāh صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيۡهِ وَسَلَّمَ was not given such authority as is stated in Sūrah al-Anʿām:

قُل لَّآ اَجِدُ فِیۡ مَاۤ اُوۡحِیَ اِلَیَّ مُحَرَّمًا

> Say (O Muḥammad صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيۡهِ وَسَلَّمَ): “In the revelation that has come to me, I do not find anything forbidden (Harām)...”

This verse is explicit that the right to declare items ḥalāl and ḥarām has not been given to Rasūlullāh صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيۡهِ وَسَلَّمَ, the basis on which ḥalāl and ḥarām is declared is *waḥī* (revelation). It is mentioned in another verse:

اِنِ الۡحُکۡمُ اِلَّا لِلّٰهِ

> Authority belongs to Allah only.[1]

Then too if we were to accept (hypothetically) that Allah Taʿālā had indeed handed over the authority to the ummah then our A'immah are no less than theirs. It is for the propagation of these laws that ambiyā’ and rusul were sent:

یٰۤاَیُّهَا الرَّسُوۡلُ بَلِّغۡ مَاۤ اُنۡزِلَ اِلَیۡکَ مِنۡ رَّبِّکَ ؕ

> O Rasūl صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيۡهِ وَسَلَّمَ! Propagate what has been revealed to you from your Rabb.

In this manner one will be saved from the criticisms of the Jews and Christians, and one’s own īmān will be rectified.

1 Sūrah Yūsuf: 40

Ibn Bābūwayh was also forced to accept the truth

Perhaps this is what Shaykh al-Sadūq, i.e. Ibn Bābūwayh, understood and absolved himself entirely from such beliefs in his book- *Al-I'tiqādāt*, and according to me earned his title of Sadūq. However when he did so, he attempted to absolve all of the Shīʿah as well saying:

من نسب الينا انا نقول انه اكثر من ذالك فهو كاذب

> Whoever claims that we have said that the Qur'ān contains more verses than it does, he is a liar.

He intended by this statement to prove the Ahl al-Sunnah to be liars but Allah Taʿālā is Truthful and always allows the truth to avail. Along came al-Kulaynī and proved al-Sadūq to be a liar, by reporting that the Qur'ān contained seventeen thousand verses as has already been discussed. How much more injustice of the Shīʿah must we discuss in this regard? I have not seen any intelligent scholar who has interpreted this verse:

> Without doubt only We have revealed the Reminder and We shall certainly be its protectors.[1]

To mean anything else but the Qur'ān is protected from all alterations and changes, whether it be from the first, second or third khalīfah.

The virtue of the Ahl al-Sunnah

If this verse is studied with a perceptive eye then a great virtue of the Ahl al-Sunnah can be seen. The details of this is that whenever any task is carried out under another or by their instruction then even though someone else may carry out the task, it will always be ascribed to the principal, director or governor. For example, if the president were to appoint a security force or regiment to protect the public treasury and each of them were to take turns guarding it, while he is

1 Sūrah al-Ḥijr: 9

sound asleep, then this action will still be attributed to the president since he is the one who ordered them to carry out this task.

Similarly, the Ahl al-Sunnah in accordance with the order of Allah have stood guard over this treasure and since they could not protect it suitably when it was on paper, they took the liberty of engraving it on their hearts as well. In other words, they dedicated their lives to its protection, preventing shayṭān and the irreligious from ever carrying out their evil intentions.

A thief will always accuse the guard of dishonesty, so here too the Shīʿah instead of showing appreciation to the Ahl al-Sunnah have opted to accuse us of dishonesty.

All virtues erased all that remains is sin

If the Ahl al-Sunnah were to have asked the Shīʿah for some recompense for having fulfilled this duty then perhaps they would have the right to make such an accusation.

Nevertheless, wherever we look in the world, we see the Ahl al-Sunnah as guardians of the Qur'ān, some towns having more than five hundred ḥuffāẓ, but since this is all in accordance with the order of Allah, it should not be attributed to the Ahl al-Sunnah but to Allah Taʿālā. The Ahl al-Sunnah should be regarded as the special servants of Allah. This is why Allah Taʿālā attributed this protection to himself:

> Without doubt only We have revealed the Reminder and We shall certainly be its protectors.

The Shīʿah are akin to those disobedient to the government, such as cut-throats and thieves, because they are enemies of the guardians of the Book of Allah, which is more valuable than any treasury, and the enemies of those who guard the state treasury are none other than thieves and cut-throats.

In summary the verse:

اِنَّا نَحْنُ نَزَّلْنَا الذِّكْرَ وَ اِنَّا لَهٗ لَحٰفِظُوْنَ ﴿٩﴾

> Without doubt only We have revealed the Reminder and We shall certainly be its protectors.

Also calls out loudly that the Ahl al-Sunnah are on the truth and the Shīʿah on falsehood, but ears are necessary in order to listen and the following verses fits them perfectly:

خَتَمَ اللّٰهُ عَلٰى قُلُوْبِهِمْ وَعَلٰى سَمْعِهِمْ

> Allah has placed a seal upon their hearts and upon their hearing.

Nonetheless, we should not become negligent in trying to make them understand. Perhaps just as Shaykh al-Sadūq has accepted one aspect, ʿAmmār ʿAlī and the other Shīʿah may also do the same. However, since it is very difficult for a radical person to accept what you say the first time around, regardless of how clear and convincing your argument might be, it is possible that a Shīʿah might say after reading this discourse that he believes the Qur'ān to be true and unchanged in any way but where does it say that we have to accept Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه also. This is why I present the next verse:

اِلَّا تَنْصُرُوْهُ فَقَدْ نَصَرَهُ اللّٰهُ اِذْ اَخْرَجَهُ الَّذِيْنَ كَفَرُوْا ثَانِىَ اثْنَيْنِ اِذْ هُمَا فِى الْغَارِ اِذْ يَقُوْلُ لِصَاحِبِهٖ لَا تَحْزَنْ اِنَّ اللّٰهَ مَعَنَا

> If you do not assist him, then indeed Allah had assisted him when the kuffār drove him out (of Makkah). He was the second of the two (the other being his bosom friend Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه) when they were (hiding from the kuffār) in the cave (outside Makkah) and he (Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم) told his companion (Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه): "Do not grieve. Verily Allah is with us."[1]

1 Sūrah Taubah: 40

Ponder over this verse with an open-mind and put aside your pride, does this verse pull you towards the Ahl al-Sunnah or towards the home of the Shīʿah? At this juncture a saying of Mirzā Kāthim ʿAlī al-Lakhnawī comes to mind, who was a senior Shīʿah scholar and also respected by Dildār ʿAlī as well. The summary of of his statement is:

> People can say what they like about whoever they want but whoever will speak ill of the first Khalīfah, then even according to me he is a kāfir.

A person from the gathering objected saying: “What are you saying, the beliefs of our religion contradicts this.” He replied:

> I am not saying this, Allah is saying it. There is no difference between the word ṣaḥib and Ṣaḥābī, both have the same meaning and here Allah is bearing testimony to the first khalīfah being a Ṣaḥābī because the word ṣahib, which appears in this verse, according to both Sunnī and Shīʿah refers to Abū Bakr al-Ṣiddīq رضي الله عنه.

Glory be to Allah! This is how fair-minded people are, like Mirzā Kāthim ʿAlī, and he was no simpleton; the Shīʿah themselves held him in high esteem. There is scarcely a Shīʿah who does not know of him and follow him. He is not wrong in his deduction as well, whichever way you look at this verse, there is no room for any other interpretation.

Commentary of the verse in Sūrah Taubah

The explanation of all of this is that the words “صاحبه” (companion) that appears in this verse has the same meaning as Ṣaḥābī in Arabic. In addition, the words “Do not grieve”, prove that Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه was a lover and devotee of Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم as well as a true sincere Mu’min. The reason being that telling him not to grieve would have no meaning if he was not, because then he would have been rejoicing at that time as (according to the Shīʿah belief) his enemy- Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم, was about to be captured. There would have been no need to even shout, the slightest flinch would have given them away.

Also understand that the fear Abū Bakr ﵁ had was not for his own life but only for the well-being of Rasūlullāh ﷺ, fearing what they might do if they discovered Rasūlullāh ﷺ. It was on this that Rasūlullāh ﷺ consoled him saying: "Do not grieve! Verily Allah is with us."

The meaning of grief

A few prejudiced individuals have said that Abū Bakr ﵁ was not fearful for the life of Rasūlullāh ﷺ, he was fearful for his own. Such claims need to be thoughout carefully because it would mean that Allah Taʿālā is unfamiliar with the prose of the Arabic language and unacquainted with the eloquence of the

Arabic language. It would render the miracle of the eloquence of the Qur'ān into murmurings of the smitten.

The details of this is that any person who knows Arabic will be aware that the word "حزن" (grief) is used in times of sadness, when parting with a beloved or in a time of hopelessness, whereas when one fears for his life then the word "خوف" (fear) is used. There is no book more eloquent and articulate as the Qur'ān. When Nabī Mūsā ﵇ climbed atop Mount Ṭūr and Allah asked him what is in your hand, he replied that it was his staff, with which he walks, leans on and herds his sheep. He was then ordered to throw it down and when he did, it turned into a huge serpent. Nabī Mūsā ﵇ turned and ran, without looking back, on which Allah Taʿālā said:

إِنِّىْ لَا يَخَافُ لَدَيَّ الْمُرْسَلُوْنَ ﴿١٠﴾

Verily the messengers do not fear in my presence.[1]

This makes it clear that Nabī Mūsā ﵇ feared for his life when he saw the serpent, which is why Allah Taʿālā said: "Do not fear" and Allah Taʿālā did not say: "Do not grieve" at this junture. Similarly when he un intentionally killed the Qibṭī, he fled fearing for his life, which is why Allah Taʿālā said:

1 Sūrah al-Naml: 10

فَخَرَجَ مِنْهَا خَائِفًا

He left the city in fear.

Aside from these verses, the word "خوف" (fear) was used many times in the Qur'ān, whenever one feared for his own life. Wherever there was sadness then the word "حزن" (grief) was used. In Sūrah Yūsuf where the sadness of Nabī Yaʿqūb عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ is mentioned on his separation from Nabī Yūsuf عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ, as well as his weeping continuously, which resulted in his family saying that you will weep for Yūsuf عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ until you also perish, he replied:

قَالَ اِنَّمَآ اَشْكُوْا بَثِّىْ وَحُزْنِىٓ اِلَى اللّٰهِ

He replied: "I complain of my sorrow and my grief only to Allah."[1]

In fact, there are many verses which prove that "حزن" (grief) and "خوف" (fear) have different meanings and one is not used in place of the other.

تَتَنَزَّلُ عَلَيْهِمُ الْمَلٰٓئِكَةُ اَلَّا تَخَافُوْا وَ لَا تَحْزَنُوْا

Angels shall surely descend to them, "Neither have any fear nor grief."[2]

In this verse both words were used, if they had the same meaning then what was the purpose of mentioning it twice? The truth is that fear and grief are two separate things; fear is used for something that is still going to occur and grief is used when the desire of the heart is lost. The opposite of grief is happiness and the opposite of fear is calm. I feel ashamed of having to explain the difference of grief, happiness, fear and calm, which are such simple things to understand. There is nothing complicated in it at all. What can a person do if someone fails to understand the difference? Nevertheless, it is possible that these prejudiced

1 Sūrah Yūsuf: 86

2 Sūrah Ḥā Mīm Sajdah: 30

individuals still have not understood, so I will attempt once again. When a person close to you passes away, then the feeling you experience is called grief and not fear. However, when there is a possibility of you being killed, then the feeling you experience is called fear and this is not called grief. If your child climbs on the roof and is about to jump then you experience fear and this is not called grief. So in short, grief is the feeling you experience in times of difficulty and fear is the feeling you experience on the possibility of harm befalling you or one you love. They cannot be used in place of each other

The understanding of the Shīʿah

In a way they are also truthful as they have a rule of understanding things the other way around. For example, ʿAmmār ʿAlī understood falsehood to mean truth, as we have already explained. All of the Shīʿah understand protectors to mean thieves, so if here too they were to do the same then the Ahl al-Sunnah should not complain but rather rejoice because agreement has been reached regarding the meaning, the difference remains in the terminology.

The summary of this is that truth in the terminology of the Shīʿah is called falsehood, protector is thief and grief is called fear. However, just as a Hindu and and Englishman when in a gathering of Muslims, hears one calling another "Baba", then in accordance with their terminology; the Englishman will think it to mean child and the Hindu will think it to mean grandfather, here too if the Shīʿah understands "Do not grieve" to mean "Do not fear" then it is no fault of theirs, it is incumbent on the Ahl al-Sunnah to speak to them in their terminology. Is it not stated in ḥadīth:

كلموا الناس على قدر عقولهم

> Speak to people according to their mental capacity.

Even if we were to consider "Do not grieve" to mean "Do not fear", as the Shīʿah do, then too it does not harm us, as then "O Abū Bakr! Do not fear!" would mean

that he did fear for his life because the kuffār hated him on account of him being a Muslim and having īmān. If this were not so then what why would Rasūlullāh ﷺ comfort him? Then too by saying: "Allah is with us!" Allah Taʿālā only assists and aids - he is only "with" - the believers:

اِنَّ اللّٰهَ مَعَ الْمُؤْمِنِيْنَ

> Allah is with the believers.

اِنَّ اللّٰهَ مَعَ الْمُتَّقِيْنَ

> Allah is with the pious.

اِنَّ اللّٰهَ مَعَ الْمُحْسِنِيْنَ

> Allah is with those who do good.

The Qur'ān is filled with such verses, the summary of which is that Allah is with those who are pure-hearted and nowhere in the Qur'ān will you ever find Allah saying that he is with the disbelievers, or the evil-doers or the hypocrites.

The true meaning of Allah being "with" a person

If any person were to say that Allah is with everybody, whether a believer or disbeliever, as it is mentioned in the Noble Qur'ān:

اَلَآ اِنَّهٗ بِكُلِّ شَيْءٍ مُّحِيْطٌ

> Verily He (Allah) encompasses everything.[1]

Therefore, since Allah encompasses everything, it necessarily means that Allah is with everything.

1 Sūrah Ḥā Mīm Sajdah: 54

The answer to this would be as follows, one can be with another in two ways:

1. The first is when two people are in one place at the same time. Here they are only with each other physically and they both might abhor each other. An example of this would be a parrot living in the same cage with a crow.

2. The second is where one is in the heart of the other. For example, if a king were to say to a destitute person, who is disliked by others: "Fear not, for we are with you." The meaning of this statement is simply that your thought will be in our minds and your concern will occupy us such that we will assist you when required.

In the second instance, it is not necessary for the poor person and the king to be in the same place. He might not be with him physically but his assistance is definitely with him.

Therefore in the verse:

اِنَّ اللّٰهَ مَعَ الْمُتَّقِيْنَ

Verily Allah is with the pious.[1]

As well as the other verses mentioned above, the second meaning will be implied, as is known to all. If this were not the case then what sort of praise would this be for the pious and how will it console them? So too in the verse under discussion, it was only mentioned with the purpose of consoling and to re-enforce the promise of assistance made above.

The verse proves that assistance descended upon Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ as well

If one were to object further and claim that the verse above establishes that Divine assistance descended upon Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and not upon Abū Bakr

1 Sūrah al-Taubah: 123

al-Ṣiddīq رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, we would reply that this is known to all and sundry that the humiliation and disgrace of a slave is considered a humiliation and disgrace upon his master. When a person harms the servants and workers of the British then why do they take it so personally that they call to arms, spilling the blood of thousands? Furthermore, we witnessed during the riots that whoever protected the government officials were considered to be loyal subjects of the government. Thus the assistance of Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ falls under the assistance rendered to Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. When we were informed of this assistance, we were told:

فَقَدْ نَصَرَهُ اللّٰهُ

Indeed Allah had assisted him.

However, when the assistance arrived, it arrived for both because when Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ informed Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ about the assistance of Allah, he did so in the following manner:

اِنَّ اللّٰهَ مَعَنَا

Verily Allah is with us.

In other words when informing us about this incident, Allah only mentioned Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and said: "And verily Allah assisted him", however when Allah provided the assistance, He assisted both Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. It is for this reason that Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ informed Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ about Allah's assistance in the following manner:

Verily Allah is with us.

A single word was used "مَعَنَا" (with us) and they were not mentioned separately: "مَعِى" and "مَعَكَ" (it was not said, Allah is with me and Allah is with you), which makes it apparent that Allah Taʿālā was with Abū Bakr al-Ṣiddīq رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ in the same manner as he was with Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ.

So based on this we learn that the Shīʿah have unwittingly agreed with us in the fact that just as Allah was with Rasūlullāh ﷺ in terms of help, concern, love and assistance, so too was He with Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه.

In addition, the wording:

ثَانِیَ اثْنَیْنِ

He was the second of the two.

Indicates that Rasūlullāh ﷺ was not alone at the time, but another was with him, namely Abū Bakr al-Ṣiddīq رضي الله عنه. Furthermore, it is the *mafʿūl* (passive participle) of the verb preceding it:

اِلَّا تَنْصُرُوْهُ

If you do not assist him.

Which proves beyond all doubt that Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه was also included in the divine assistance.

If the Shīʿah were to then argue that the statement of Rasūlullāh ﷺ:

اِنَّ اللّٰهَ مَعَنَا

Verily Allah is with us.

is in actual fact affixed to the sentence:

اِذْ اَخْرَجَهُ الَّذِیْنَ كَفَرُوْا

When the Kuffār drove him out.

and is in fact its *mafʿūl* (passive participle), rendering its meaning to be that at the time, when the disbelievers of Makkah drove Rasūlullāh ﷺ out of Makkah,

he was not alone, rather his acquaintance was with him. In this manner it will have no connection with the يivine assistance. The divine assistance would only apply if it had been affixed to:

فَقَدْ نَصَرَهُ اللّٰهُ

Indeed Allah had assisted him.

To this rhetoric, we give the following answer: if this is the meaning of this verse then it is exactly what we desired. As in this case it would mean that the Shīʿah too have learnt that the kuffār had the same enmity for Abū Bakr رَضِيَ ٱللَّٰهُ عَنْهُ as they had for Rasūlullāh صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ.

If anyone were to say that Abū Bakr رَضِيَ ٱللَّٰهُ عَنْهُ was not driven out by the kuffār but rather it was Rasūlullāh صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ who asked him to accompany him then we ask the Shīʿah to answer this, as this meaning was only expounded by us on account of them. If they were to have asked us its meaning in the first place then we would have related it to them. In addition, Rasūlullāh صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ was not driven out according to the literal meaning of the word, whereby they dragged him along and expelled him.

The actual course of events

The actual course of events was that the disbelievers had gathered at Dār al-Nadwah, which was the courtyard in the home of Abū Jahal, at that time situated next to the Kaʿbah, where the Hanafī Musallah was later built and today forms part of the Masjid al-Harām. It was here where they consulted with each other as to what course of action they should adopt with Rasūlullāh صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ; should they imprison him; or was killing him more appropriate or perhaps even to exile him. Allah informed his beloved about their plans and Rasūlullāh صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ took Abū Bakr رَضِيَ ٱللَّٰهُ عَنْهُ with him as his companion and they set out for the Cave of Thowr, and after acquiring the necessary provisions they set off for Madīnah three days later. This incident is briefly made reference to in Sūrah al-Anfāl:

وَ اِذۡ يَمۡكُرُ بِكَ الَّذِيۡنَ كَفَرُوۡا لِيُثۡبِتُوۡكَ اَوۡ يَقۡتُلُوۡكَ اَوۡ يُخۡرِجُوۡكَ ؕ وَيَمۡكُرُوۡنَ وَيَمۡكُرُ اللّٰهُ ؕ وَاللّٰهُ خَيۡرُ الۡمٰكِرِيۡنَ ۝٣٠

When the Kuffār schemed against you to imprison you, kill you or exile you (drive you out of Makkah). They plan and Allah plans. Allah is the best of planners.[1]

Ponder over this incident! You will come to the conclusion that Rasūlullāh ﷺ was not physically thrown out of his homeland. If one were to argue that constantly fearing exile is tantamount to exile itself, then we ask: what peace did Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه enjoy from the kuffār? In fact, before this event they had already attempted to exile him, had it not been for the intercession of Ibn Daghīnah, who warded them off. These narrations can be found in the books of the Ahl al-Sunnah. Furthermore, there is nothing illogical about things transpiring in this particular manner as the manner in which Allah Taʿālā makes mention of this in the Noble Qur'ān:

اِذۡ يَقُوۡلُ لِصَاحِبِهٖ لَا تَحۡزَنۡ اِنَّ اللّٰهَ مَعَنَا

When he (Rasūlullāh ﷺ) told his companion (Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه): "Do not grieve. Verily Allah is with us."

Informs us that the disbelievers hated Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه as well; if not then why would Rasūlullāh ﷺ console him and why would Allah be with him and then too in the same manner that He was with Rasūlullāh ﷺ.

After listening to this discussion we are entirely convinced that the Shīʿah will never mention that Rasūlullāh ﷺ only took Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه along so that he will be unable to inform the disbelievers of his whereabouts. This verse has ripped to shreds the entire basis of this possibility such that even if they were to labour until the end of days, they will never be able to construct it again.

1 Sūrah al-Anfāl: 30

Furthermore, the beloved messenger Rasūlullāh ﷺ, Allah forbid and we seek refuge in Allah, was not lacking in intelligence but rather his intelligence was legendary; did he not perceive the terrible outcome of informing Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه of his plans and instead rather keep him in the dark from the outset and not tell him: "I am going to take refuge in the Cave of Thowr."

Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه was not an imām of the Shīʿah, who was blessed with the knowledge of all that has passed and what will come to pass, such that he would have known of the plans of Rasūlullāh ﷺ whether he informed him of it or not. Furthermore, *taqiyyah* (dissimulation) would be most necessary in this circumstance and according to the Shīʿah, Rasūlullāh ﷺ taking refuge in the cave is also a form of taqiyyah, the details of which will be discussed later. Nevertheless, according to the Shīʿah paradigm taqiyyah is compulsory in such instances and to lie in such a circumstance is entirely permissible, but rather essential. Instead they claim that the praises which the illustrious A'immah adorned the three khulafā with, as well as the other Ṣaḥābah, was in actual fact taqiyyah. Allah forbid! The actions of Rasūlullāh ﷺ negate any possibility of such deceit, as then what need was there to take Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه along with him to the Cave of Thowr. If he were to have gone on his own then he would have had no fear, but by taking him along the very fear because of which he was taking him along would multiply. What was there to prevent him from yelling out and giving away their position? This would then be a perfect example of the saying:

> To avoid the rain, he stood beneath the tap
> To safe himself from the sun, he jumped into the fire

Thus, if this was the wisdom of taking Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه along then this was extremely unwise indeed.

The involuntary rectification to the truth

This is the reason why Mullāh ʿAbd Allāh al-Mashadī was forced to write in *Īthār al-Ḥaqq* that this possibility is indeed far-fetched. However, this is akin to the

parable of the Hindu pundit, who denounced Hinduism after seventy-years but did not have the courage to announce it publicly out of fear for his own status.

Now listen to what I have to say, the statement of Mullāh ʿAbd Allāh al-Mashadī is absolutely correct and if it is on account of this that he has named his book *Īthār al-Ḥaqq* (declaration of the truth) then it has earned its title. We too are not afraid to accept this, even if he may be of the Shīʿah faith. The problem however is that despite Mullāh ʿAbd Allāh al-Mashadī being a recognised leader of the Shīʿah, by the Shīʿah scholars and common masses alike, they are not prepared to accept his word. Instead they all claim: "What is astonishing about Rasūlullāh صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ taking Abū Bakr رَضِيَ ٱللَّٰهُ عَنْهُ along on this journey because he had given his daughter to Rasūlullāh صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ in marriage and he embraced Islam prior to many others, spending a great deal of his time in the service of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ." The possibility of the Shīʿah reforming is minimal but in fact it is highly possible that they will dissociate themselves from this scholar instead.

The true events of hijrah

Whether a person accepts or does not accept, the heart testifies, whether Ahl al-Sunnah or Shīʿah, that the only reason why Abū Bakr رَضِيَ ٱللَّٰهُ عَنْهُ was taken along on this journey was because the kuffār understood him to be the adviser, aide and supporter of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. They also knew him to be the close friend and beloved of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and why should they not? Ahl al-Sunnah or Shīʿah, none are ignorant of the fact that it was Abū Bakr رَضِيَ ٱللَّٰهُ عَنْهُ who suffered alongside Rasūlullāh صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ at the hands of the kuffār, who defended Rasūlullāh صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, spent his wealth on him and endured great difficulty. He liberated Bilāl رَضِيَ ٱللَّٰهُ عَنْهُ from the shackles of the disbelievers. Similarly, he sacrificed his entire family for the pleasure of Allah and His messenger.

This is why Rasūlullāh صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ was convinced that the kuffār bore the same hatred for Abū Bakr رَضِيَ ٱللَّٰهُ عَنْهُ as they bore for him and the very same punishment they had planned for him, they had planned for Abū Bakr رَضِيَ ٱللَّٰهُ عَنْهُ. He had challenged many of the kuffār and repeatedly informed them that the dīn of Islam is the true dīn, so

abandon your worship of these idols. If success is what you seek then follow the Rasūl of Allah ﷺ. Rasūlullāh ﷺ was convinced that if he were to leave Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه behind then the kuffār would most definitely execute him.

Without a doubt, if ʿUmar رضي الله عنه were to be left behind then there would be no room for concern as the kuffār would not dare quarrel with him on account of the kuffār still having some form of regard for him, the most significant point of which would be that he was the maternal nephew of their leader- Abū Jahal, whereas the other Ṣaḥābah had no such privilege. Most importantly ʿUmar رضي الله عنه was capable of defending himself.

Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه on the other hand was a thorn in the side of the disbelievers and they would writhe in anger at the mere sight of him. If he were to be killed then a great stalwart of īmān and Islam would be lost. If he were to be killed then such a companion would be lost whose compassion and sincerity was exemplary, such sincerity and love that it would leave an indelible mark on the heart, influencing the actions of others.

Moreover such a dangerous journey cannot be undertaken without a companion and the companion should be such that he has no concern for his own life, his familial love should not supersede his love for Allah and His messenger, he should be experienced in both summer and winter weather patterns, a seasoned traveller, intelligent, wise to the ways of the world, possessing great courage, of high disposition, forthright, one whose trustworthiness has been tested time and again, devout, one for whom the speech stored in the chambers of the heart is opened, a pure hearted soul, one in whose company, perplexity, strangeness and anxiety all dissipate. Rasūlullāh ﷺ saw all these qualities only in Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه and this is the reason why he went to his house in the afternoon, arranged all travel plans with him after which both arrived at the Cave of Thowr. ʿAbd Allāh ibn Abī Bakr رضي الله عنه, the son of Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه, acted as a spy for them and related all information he could glean from the disbelievers to Rasūlullāh ﷺ and his father.

Responding to the Shīʿah perception

If the family of Abū Bakr رَضِيَ ٱللَّٰهُ عَنْهُ bore any enmity to Rasūlullāh صَلَّىٰ ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ then would such arrangements have been possible? If we were to hypothetically accept that this conspiracy was possible then what better opportunity could he have had to actualize his 'enmity' and fulfil his wishes by handing over Rasūlullāh صَلَّىٰ ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ to the disbelievers? The Shīʿah should study their own books and inform me if I have been false in relating this incident. If any difference is found then he is free to do as he pleases. A fair-minded person will be left with no other alternative but to acknowledge the fact that Rasūlullāh صَلَّىٰ ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ taking Abū Bakr رَضِيَ ٱللَّٰهُ عَنْهُ along with him as his companion on *hijrah* (migration) is such a great virtue that it cannot be equalled by any other, such that even ʿAlī رَضِيَ ٱللَّٰهُ عَنْهُ sleeping in the bed of Rasūlullāh cannot equal it.

All would have probably seen, during times of unrest, that when warrants of arrest are issued for the perpetrators, the others who reside in the house are not arrested. On the contrary, whoever is seen as his cohorts or accomplices are regarded to be equally guilty as the perpetrator himself.

It is of considerable regret that the testimony of Allah and his messenger in favour of Abū Bakr رَضِيَ ٱللَّٰهُ عَنْهُ is not accepted and then too only because they testify to his īmān. If you do not accept the word of Allah then what will you accept? This is when you invent various illogical interpretations and are willing to believe the most far-fetched hypothesis such that if it is compared with what the Qur'ān truly says then not even an atom of what the Qur'ān says can be found in it.

The fair-minded interpretation of the verse

We have no doubt that the Shīʿah understand this verse to have the very same meaning as we have expounded; namely that if Abū Bakr رَضِيَ ٱللَّٰهُ عَنْهُ was distressed at the time, then it was only because Rasūlullāh صَلَّىٰ ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ was defenceless and at the mercy of the kuffār at that time and he thought to himself: "What can I possibly do alone against these enemies, who will discover us with a simple glance towards their feet."

However, such levels of helplessness and incapacity warrants the assistance of Allah as Allah Taʿālā says:

حَتّٰٓى اِذَا اسْتَيْـَٔسَ الرُّسُلُ وَظَنُّوْٓا اَنَّهُمْ قَدْ كُذِبُوْا جَآءَهُمْ نَصْرُنَا

> Until the time came when (even) the rusul grew despondent and thought that they had erred in their understanding, then Our assistance came to them.[1]

Similarly, it was on account of the utter despondency of Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ at this juncture that the assistance descended and the glad tidings of:

لَا تَحْزَنْ اِنَّ اللّٰهَ مَعَنَا

> Do not grieve. Verily Allah is with us.

In other words, O Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ! Do not be despondent or sad. Be consoled that our Rabb is with both of us.

Essentially this promise came to pass and both were saved from the evil clutches of the kuffār, and they reached Madīnah safely. The manner in which the light of Islam shone forth from this point is common knowledge and clearer than the sun. Thus Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ deserves our utmost gratitude and supplications because had it not been for his concern and distress then this outcome would never have materialised. It was on account of this concern and distress that led to the lands of Iran being liberated from the hands of the kuffār, giving the Shīʿah a homeland, but these unappreciative ilk, instead of expressing gratefulness, express such repulsive sentiment towards him, the likes of which no person will articulate for his benefactor.

Another laughable interpretation of the Shīʿah and its refutation

At times some become extremely prejudiced and say that up until this point in time Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ was exactly as is understood from the Word of Allah but

1 Sūrah Yūsuf: 110

he did not remain the same thereafter. This pseudo-objection does not merit a response rather it would be better for the Shīʿah to never utter such an allegation as this would prompt the Hindu and British to mockingly say: "Farewell to such a deity who is unaware of what is to transpire a few days from now." Furthermore, if we were to hypothetically accept this (merely relating the outcome of their belief but not ascribing to it) that Allah was unaware of the crimes which Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه would later perpetrate and only erroneously uttered these remarks, then it would demand that Allah Taʿālā prove His Word to be true and bring the 'deceiving' Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه back to the straight path, by force if need be. After all, this is the Lord and Master of the Universe we are talking about and not some ordinary person, who would sit idly by while his word is proven false. Allah Taʿālā said to Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه: "I am with you", and Allah has also said:

لَا تَبْدِيْلَ لِكَلِمٰتِ اللّٰهِ

There is nothing that can change the words (and promises) of Allah.[1]

مَا يُبَدَّلُ الْقَوْلُ لَدَيَّ

The decision (order) that proceeds from Me shall never be altered.[2]

Both verses have the same meaning, which is that the word of Allah does not change. How then is it possible that Allah Taʿālā abandoned Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه, such that shayṭān then took hold of him or to put it more blatantly that Allah was with Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه but then could not withstand the onslaught of shayṭān and was forced to abandon him, Allah Taʿālā is indeed pure and above that. Instead it would be more prudent for the Shīʿah to never utter such allegations.

The wording of the verse utterly silences any Shīʿah response

They fail to understand that firstly the statement:

1 Sūrah Yūnus: 64

2 Sūrah Qāf: 29

اِنَّ اللّٰهَ مَعَنَا

> Verily Allah is with us.

is such a sentence, that in accordance with Arabic prose, it denotes perpetuity. Those acquainted with Arabic and the laws of *balāghah* (eloquence) would be well-aware of this, and even to ʿAmmār ʿAlī, this much is absolutely certain.

Secondly, if we were to all accept that this verse does not prove any perpetuity then the Shīʿah will have to admit to the fact that Rasūlullāh ﷺ and Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه jointly shared in the closeness and assistance at that moment. Now, it is absolutely impossible that Allah Taʿālā ever separated from Rasūlullāh ﷺ and abandoned being close to him and assisting him. This implies that the share of Rasūlullāh ﷺ in the verse:

> Verily Allah is with us.

was in fact perpetual, which would warrant that the share of Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه also be perpetual. The reason being that both were referred to in one instance and not separately; the words "مَعِى"(with me) and "مَعَكَ" (with you) were not used.

Thirdly, even if we were to overlook all of the above, we will say that the statement of shayṭān appears in Sūrah Sā'd as follows:

قَالَ فَبِعِزَّتِكَ لَاُغْوِيَنَّهُمْ اَجْمَعِيْنَ ﴿٨٢﴾ اِلَّا عِبَادَكَ مِنْهُمُ الْمُخْلَصِيْنَ ﴿٨٣﴾

> He (Iblīs) said, "I swear by Your honour! I shall definitely mislead all of them except your sincere slaves amongst them.[1]

As they are beyond his reach on account of them being under the refuge of Allah. In Sūrah al-Ḥijr, after the words: "Except your sincere slaves from amongst them", Allah by way of attestation to the words of shayṭān states:

1 Sūrah Ṣād: 82

اِنَّ عِبَادِىْ لَيْسَ لَكَ عَلَيهِمْ سُلْطٰنٌ

Indeed you will have no power over My bondsmen.[1]

In other words, shayṭān is being told that you are truthful in your statement that whoever seeks refuge in Me, you will have no influence over them. Therefore ponder deeply over this verse:

اِنَّ اللّٰهَ مَعَنَا

Verily Allah is with us.

It clearly proves Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه having come into the refuge of Allah, in other words that he has come into the court or within the borders of Allah. So shayṭān does not have the ability to remove anybody from this proximity, so then who is there who can remove Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه? If they respond by saying that Allah Himself has removed Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه then this is in itself incorrect as Allah has said:

اِنَّ اللّٰهَ لَا يُغَيِّرُ مَا بِقَوْمٍ حَتّٰى يُغَيِّرُوْا مَابِاَنْفُسِهِمْ

Undoubtedly Allah does not change the condition of a nation until they change the condition within themselves.[2]

The impossibility of his condition changing

Moreover it was impossible for the condition of Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه to have changed on account of satanic enticement or deception because it is evident, in fact clearer than the sun, that capability is required in order to carry out any action. In order for one to give charity, generosity is required. Similarly, to march into battle would first require bravery. The same applies in evil and sin as well, it too

1 Sūrah al-Ḥijr: 42

2 Sūrah al-Raʿd: 11

requires an ability or capability. Thus if that ability did exist within him then Allah Taʿālā removed it. Allah Taʿālā says it so beautifully in the Qur’ān:

اَلْخَبِيْثٰتُ لِلْخَبِيْثِيْنَ وَ الْخَبِيْثُوْنَ لِلْخَبِيْثٰتِ ۚ وَ الطَّيِّبٰتُ لِلطَّيِّبِيْنَ وَ الطَّيِّبُوْنَ لِلطَّيِّبٰتِ ۚ

> Impure women are for impure men and impure men are for impure women. Pure women are for pure men and pure men are for pure women.[1]

In fact, the statement that was made at this juncture:,

اِنَّ اللّٰهَ مَعَنَا

> Verily Allah is with us.

establishes that Allah will not be separated from him. The reason being that if the statement:

اِنَّ اللّٰهَ مَعَ الْمُؤْمِنِيْنَ

> Verily Allah is with the believers.

Were to have been mentioned after the words:

لَا تَحْزَنْ

> Do not grieve!

Then too we would understand that Allah will only be with us as long as we have īmān and īmān is a prerequisite for the proximity of Allah. If one were to lose his īmān then we would understand that he has lost the proximity to Allah as well. However in this instance, where Allah has not mentioned any condition for His proximity, it will mean that it is perpetual and will never be lost. The

1 Sūrah al-Nūr: 26

connection created through the bonds of blood can never be broken whereas those friendships based upon good character and goodness will remain as long as the good character and goodness prevails. This is the reason why friendships often break but familial ties remain intact. In essence, familial ties are attached to yourself whereas the ties of friendship are attached to acts of virtue. Therefore since Allah said:

اِنَّ اللّٰهَ مَعَنَا

> Verily Allah is with us.

And not:

اِنَّ اللّٰهَ مَعَ الْمُؤْمِنِيْنَ

Verily Allah is with the believers.

Or any other expression, whereby it requires a particular quality, it becomes known that the ties of togetherness between Allah and Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ is attached to his person and not any particular quality (that may be lost tomorrow).

Thus, if the relationship were to change then it would change in accordance with the verse:

اِنَّ اللّٰهَ لَا يُغَيِّرُ مَا بِقَوْمٍ حَتّٰى يُغَيِّرُوْا مَابِاَنْفُسِهِمْ

> Undoubtedly Allah does not change the condition of a nation until they change the condition within themselves.[1]

This stipulates that Allah Taʿālā changes the relationship on account of the qualities in a person changing. So when a change in relationship arises it will

1 Sūrah Raʿd: 11

be on account of those qualities (on which the relationship was based) having changed and not without reason. The corollary of the Shīʿah argument would be that Allah had committed a major oversight for failing to mention the quality upon which the relationship was based (i.e. in the verse: "Verily Allah is with us!") and instead of saying:

> Verily Allah is with the believers.

erroneously said:

> Verily Allah is with us.

We seek refuge in Allah from such evil misunderstandings and from ever perceiving that Allah Taʿālā could err or forget. Verily Allah Taʿālā is as described by Nabī Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ:

لَا يَضِلُّ رَبِّىْ وَ لَا يَنْسَى

> My Rabb does not err nor does he forget.[1]

The status of Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ

Objectively, if impartiality were to reign, then the words "With us" would be understood to accord Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ a status close too (but below) that of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, which is a level of proximity that he has conferred on both of them. This will make it incumbent to award him the title of "al-Ṣiddīq al-Akbar" and that he be regarded as the most superior of not only this Ummah but of previous nations as well (aside from the ambiyā'). If it is said that the ceiling of his status was the floor level of that of nubuwwah, which is suitably provided by the fact that he was a partner to the messenger in a certain matter, then both the Ahl al-Sunnah and Shīʿah know that there is no station which is linked to the station of nubuwwah other than the station of Ṣiddīqiyyah. The reason being that Allah

1 Sūrah Ṭāhā: 52

makes mention of the Ṣiddiqīn immediately after the ambiyā', which informs us that in every nation there will be a Ṣiddīq whose status will be connected to that of the nabī and fall just under the status of that nabī. Since the nubuwwah of Muḥammad ﷺ surpasses that of the other ambiyā' so too will the Ṣiddīq of this nation surpass the Ṣiddiqīn of all other nations.

This should suffice for the objective and if Allah grants understanding to the prejudiced then only will they understand. Where is it possible for a weak person such as myself to make them understand? However, it is incumbent upon me to mention this much as an advice:

> The enemies of those whom Allah has sided with are doomed.

Another Shīʿah diversion

After the discussion above, the only avenue left for one to adopt would be to say that:

لَا تَحْزَنْ اِنَّ اللّٰهَ مَعَنَا

> Do not grieve. Verily Allah is with us.

is in reality not the speech of Allah but the speech of Rasūlullāh ﷺ and Allah is simply narrating it and not speaking from Himself. Whatever emanated from the blessed tongue of the Nabī ﷺ, Allah quoted verbatim just as He quoted the statement of Fir'oun:

اَنَا رَبُّكُمُ الْاَعْلٰى

> I am your highest Rabb![1]

And the statement of shayṭān:

1 Sūrah al-Nāziʿāt: 24

اَنَا خَيْرٌ مِّنْهُ

I am better than him.[1]

Even though Rasūlullāh ﷺ was a nabī, he was still a human being and as is well-known, man is prone to mistakes and forgetfulness. So it is not far-fetched that Rasūlullāh ﷺ could have made a mistake.

The answer to this assertion, which must be a source of great pride for the Shīʿah and bringing no less joy for them than the celebration of ʿĪd Bābā Shajāʿ al-Dīn[2], and even though they are prepared to claim a donkey as their father to distance themselves from the truth expounded by the Ahl al-Sunnah, they will have to listen to what I say, they need not read the entire Sūrah but merely this verse:

وَمَا يَنْطِقُ عَنِ الْهَوٰى ۞ اِنْ هُوَ اِلَّا وَحْيٌ يُّوْحٰى ۞

He does not speak of his own desires. Whatever he says is revelation (which Allah has) revealed to him.[3]

There is no possibility of whims and fancies, no exaggerated praise or deception nor anything based upon personal understanding.

The third khalīfah ʿUthmān رضي الله عنه (according to the Shīʿah) removed verses upon verses from the Qur'ān, which expound the virtues and superiority of ʿAlī رضي الله عنه, the 'wasī of Rasūlullāh ﷺ', never mind verses entire sūrahs proving the legitimacy of his khilāfah were removed, so in response, if he were to have removed this one verse, which obviously establishes the excellence of the first khalīfah

1 Sūrah Ṣād: 76

2 ʿĪd Bāba Shajāʿ al-Dīn is a Shīʿī custom wherein they celebrate and rejoice upon the martyrdom of ʿUmar ibn al-Khattāb رضي الله عنه at the hands of the Zoroastrian Abū Lū'lū', whom they have awarded the honorary title of *Bābā Shajāʿ al-Dīn.*

3 Sūrah al-Najm: 3,4

Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه, then it would be no less then recompensing evil with evil the like thereof or even less than this, since this is all it establishes. So the removal of this one verse would in no way be equal to the removal of the thousands of verses in his honour, especially since the removal of this verse will not result in any right being usurped. Furthermore, ʿUthmān رضي الله عنه managed to not only remove these verses from the Qur'ān but also remove the honour of ʿAlī رضي الله عنه from the hearts of the people. Nevertheless, I have strayed far off the topic, this verse makes it clear that the statements of Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم are the statements of Allah, more so when it pertains to the knowledge of the unseen. Since proximity with Allah is not something visible to the eye it is of the first category of unseen knowledge. This includes the verse:

لَا تَحْزَنْ اِنَّ اللّٰهَ مَعَنَا

Do not grieve. Verily Allah is with us.

amongst the *mutashābihāt*, which do not allow the application of logic in their interpretation. Thus, it is impossible for any person to say that many impending events are ascertained through the use of the intellect, such as the possibility of solar or lunar eclipses, so similarly in this case, what harm is there if Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم deduced this by use of his intellect.

On the contrary if it were pertaining to some law of prohibition or permission in dīn then it would be possible to apply ijtihād and there would have been no harm in Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم doing so, just as the A'immah of the past had done. The Ahl al-Sunnah do indeed believe in the ijtihād of the Nabī صلى الله عليه وسلم but when it comes to the verse:

لَا تَحْزَنْ اِنَّ اللّٰهَ مَعَنَا

Do not grieve. Verily Allah is with us.

There is no other interpretation except what was clearly mentioned by Rasūlullāh

ﷺ as it was all based upon revelation and not the personal opinion or ijtihād of Rasūlullāh ﷺ. There is no interpretation to this verse that can support the perception of the Shīʿah because if Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه was not accepted in the court of Allah, as the Shīʿah believe, but rather he later turned to kufr then Rasūlullāh ﷺ would never have comforted him in this manner. What would have prompted Rasūlullāh ﷺ to lie in this manner?

The lame excuse of taqiyyah

If anybody were to say that it was *taqiyyah* (dissimulation), then the response would be that taqiyyah takes place when there is some form of fear. Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه was not a wrestler and nor was Rasūlullāh ﷺ a weakling. Leave alone one opponent, Rasūlullāh ﷺ defeated many wrestlers. Many opportunities to kill Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه presented itself where no questions would be asked.

Secondly, if Rasūlullāh ﷺ had practiced taqiyyah then he would have sufficed himself with compassionate and kind words. Rasūlullāh ﷺ was not limited to these few words of re-assurance, but in terms of speech, he was equipped with great eloquence. After all he was the most eloquent of all, Arabs and non-Arabs alike. If it had been necessary for words of comfort to be used, then there are many other forms of expression at hand and what need was there for deceit.

Furthermore, we seek refuge in Allah that we should have to utter such a thing, but based on the Shīʿah view, if he was coerced into such deceit, then our argument would be that he could have used an insinuation instead. In place of:

لَا تَحْزَنْ اِنَّ اللّٰهَ مَعَنَا

> Do not grieve. Verily Allah is with us.

He could have said:

إِنَّ اللّٰهَ مَعَ الْمُؤْمِنِيْنَ

> Verily Allah is with the believers.

This would have served as an assurance and the matter would have been closed and resolved, and in so doing Rasūlullāh ﷺ would have been saved from deceit.

If Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه was indeed a hypocrite, Allah forbid, then by this statement he would think that Rasūlullāh ﷺ regards him as a believer and friend, and if on the other hand he was a true believer, who later abandoned Islam then Rasūlullāh ﷺ would still be true in his statement. Allah Taʿālā never forgets, so as long as he would remain a believer Allah would be with him and once Īmān left his heart then Allah Taʿālā would have also abandoned him.

Explanation of the term "صاحب" and the claim that it does not have the same meaning of Ṣaḥābī

After this explanation, I will conclude with a caution. It should be borne in mind that certain enemies of intellect might experience the following difficulty and claim that Allah Taʿālā says:

وَمَآ اَرْسَلْنَا مِنْ رَّسُوْلٍ اِلَّا بِلِسَانِ قَوْمِهٖ

> We sent every Rasūl with the language of his nation so that he may clearly explain to them.[1]

Thus, Nabī ﷺ would then speak in accordance with the rules of the Arabic language and as a result of this principle we see that the Noble Qur'ān also articulates itself in accordance with this usage. Thus the word "صاحب" (ṣāḥib) only means to accompany and it will be unjust to award it the same meaning as Ṣaḥābī, because the word Ṣaḥābī according to the Sharīʿah refers to a person

1 Sūrah Ibrāhīm: 4

who has in a state of īmān remained in the company of Rasūlullāh ﷺ, whether it be for a little or long while. According to certain ʿulamā in order for a person to be considered a Ṣaḥābī, he would have had to remain in the company of Rasūlullāh ﷺ for a long period. Whatever the case may be, the point is that the concept of īmān is inherent to the word Ṣaḥābī and not to the word "صاحب" (ṣāḥib). In short, īmān is synonymous with the word Ṣaḥābī and, firstly, the word ṣāḥib is no technical definition in the Sharīʿah whereas in Sharīʿah the word that is used is Ṣaḥābī. Secondly, even if we were to accept that the word ṣāḥib is also employed as a technical term, the fact remains that the Qur'ān was revealed in conformity to the Arabic language and not in conformity to technical definitions. Thirdly, even if we were to believe that the companionship of Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه is established from the word of Allah and that it is also an implicit indication of his īmān, where in this verse does it state that he will remain with īmān until his death. Thus this verse will not refute those who claim that Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه had forsaken Islam later.

Even if ṣāḥib does not have the same meaning as Ṣaḥābī there is no harm

The answer to these arguments is that the establishment of Abū Bakr's رضي الله عنه īmān and him remaining steadfast thereupon has been established through the connation of the blessed words:

إِلَّا عِبَادَكَ مِنْهُمُ الْمُخْلَصِينَ ﴿٨٢﴾

> Except your sincere slaves amongst them.[1]

As well as the words:

إِنَّ عِبَادِي لَيْسَ لَكَ عَلَيْهِمْ سُلْطَانٌ

> Indeed you will have no power over My bondsmen.[2]

1 Sūrah Ṣād: 82

2 Sūrah al-Ḥijr: 42

This has already been discussed at length and there is no need for repetition. Thus, when his īmān is established from the above mentioned verse and companionship is established from the word ṣāḥib in the verse, then what meaning of Ṣaḥābī is then found wanting? In this case, even if the word ṣāḥib does not have the same meaning as Ṣaḥābī it matters not. Furthermore, the meaning of the word ṣāḥib being known while the term Ṣaḥābī only being used in the technical sense; this usage is defined to this age only. Even if it did apply in the era of nubuwwah then too it would be similar to the manner in which Rasūlullāh ﷺ was known by the name Muḥammad but Nabī ʿĪsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام gave the glad tidings of the coming of Aḥmad, as is mentioned in Sūrah al-Ṣaff. In essence, when two words are synonymous, it is no problem for the less common word to be used instead of the more common one.

As far as the Qur'ān being revealed in accordance with the common usage of Arabic diction, this does not mean that every word Allah Taʿālā uses has to carry the meaning which the Arabs commonly assign to it. The word ṣalāh, zakāh, ṣowm and Ḥajj are all examples of words that do not have their literal meaning but rather a technical definition in Sharīʿah. Thus the word ṣāḥib has been used in the same light.

The correct implication

The general rule is that whenever a new nabī is sent then he comes with new laws and many a time to understand these new laws, one needs to understand all related issues as well; since most of it was not known before. So it is not necessary for every word to have the same meaning that it is used for in that language. However, every language has its own laws. When it is difficult to convey a certain concept then it uses commonly used words of that language to convey its theme but now that word will have an additional meaning. Those well-acquainted with the Arabic language will understand both the old and new meanings of words like ṣowm, ṣalāh, etc. This is how the word ṣāḥib or Ṣaḥābī should be understood. Thus, one needs to understand the linguistic meaning of ṣāḥib and then its technical meaning in Sharīʿah as well. Even though the word ṣāḥib is normally used in its

linguistic meaning and the word Ṣaḥābī is used with the technical meaning, at the same time, the word ṣāḥib is also used for the second meaning (of Ṣaḥābī) but only if ascribed to Rasūlullāh ﷺ. Therefore, there should be no confusion as to when the word ṣāḥib is used with the technical meaning in Sharīʿah. The people who study the ḥadīth of Rasūlullāh ﷺ will understand this easily.

Therefore any word mentioned in the Qur'ān or ḥadīth with the technical definition in mind; it would be utterly preposterous to then consider it using its linguistic meaning. Words like ṣalāh, zakāh, ṣowm, etc, need to be understood according to their technical definition of Sharīʿah and very rarely are they used with their linguistic meanings in mind.

If for arguments sake, we were to accept that the word "صاحبه" which is derived from the word ṣāḥib is not intended for its technical definition then too according to common usage it will still be attached to Rasūlullāh ﷺ, because during the time of Rasūlullāh ﷺ whenever the word was used, even by non-believers, they used it to refer to the companions of Rasūlullāh ﷺ. It did not mean that the person referred to was their companion, instead they meant that he was the companion of Rasūlullāh ﷺ. They would say that he deserted our religion and chose the religion of Muḥammad ﷺ.

The word "ṣāḥib" has extra merit when compared to the word "Ṣaḥābī"

In actual fact, the word "ṣāḥib" having its linguistic meaning here will add more meaning to the verse as opposed to its technical definition. The explanation of this is that in this instance the word "ṣāḥib" will only mean companion and it will refer to the companionship hinted at in the beginning of the verse:

اِذْ هُمَا فِی الْغَارِ

When they were in the cave.

In this instance the meaning of the verse will be:

> Our support came when both of them were in the cave and Rasūlullāh ﷺ was saying to his companion...

It is obvious that such companionship is required at this time which is most sincere, and the sincerity and spirit of sacrifice shown by Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه on this hour cannot be equaled by anyone nor can it be denied. If Allah did not make mention of this companionship here then too it would not matter as it had become so well-known that it had become an adage. The Shīʿah can deny it and in their hearts they know that his companionship to Rasūlullāh ﷺ at this moment cannot be equaled by anyone. Even Rasūlullāh ﷺ himself did not regard anyone's friendship to be greater than Abū Bakr's رضي الله عنه. In the same manner the friendship and companionship of Rasūlullāh ﷺ outweighed all others in the eyes of Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه. In this manner, he is considered to be the best amongst the companions of Rasūlullāh ﷺ, and why should he not when Allah Taʿālā has announced him being the companion of Rasūlullāh ﷺ in the cave and his title of Al-Ṣiddīq has become so common that even his enemies know this to be his title.

Shīʿah attempts to undermine the right of Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه to khilāfah

One might argue that even if Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه was the best Ṣaḥābī, it does not matter as the right of khilāfah belonged to ʿAlī رضي الله عنه since he was the cousin of Rasūlullāh ﷺ and his son-in-law too, and according to the norms of society the son-in-law is as good as a son, therefore the khilāfah belonged to ʿAlī رضي الله عنه. At the least, Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه should have made a bequest for the khilāfah to pass to ʿAlī رضي الله عنه after his demise but he did no such thing. Instead he made a bequest in favour of ʿUmar رضي الله عنه.

The reply to this is that such confusion comes about when one equates khilāfah to the hereditary rule of a kingdom. However, for the people of understanding it is clear that khilāfah after nubuwwah is one of the greatest pillars of dīn, whereas hereditary rule is one of the worst concepts in matters of worldly affairs. Therefore, one cannot equate the highest level of dīn to worldly matters when

there is a distinctive difference between the two.

If one compares the khulafā of the ambiyā’ with the khulafā of knowledge then that analogy might work since knowledge is also a part of dīn. However, here too it is common knowledge that there is no hereditary rule. It is on account of aptitude and perfection that one is selected. The word khilāfah too suggests the same, as it means deputyship. A deputy is one who is capable of fulfilling the duty of the represented individual. If a number of people are capable of carrying out this duty then precedence will be granted to the one who surpasses the others. Thus, when Abū Bakr al-Ṣiddīq رضي الله عنه has been established to be the best after the ambiyā’ then how is it possible for ʿAlī رضي الله عنه to be more deserving of the right to khilāfah? Yes! Most certainly ʿAlī رضي الله عنه also deserves the post of khilāfah but it will be in order of superiority. As for the accusation of usurping the khilāfah, I ask you that when Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه had the most right to be khalīfah that what is wrong if he took the post? It was after all his right, so whose right did he usurp? Furthermore, those who are well-versed with the incidents of history, will be able to inform you whether the khilāfah was thrust on his shoulders by the Ṣaḥābah or whether he snatched it all by himself?

As far as him appointing ʿUmar رضي الله عنه as his successor after him, firstly it needs to be understood again that hereditary has no role in the appointment of a khalīfah. If it did then Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها and after her, Ḥasan رضي الله عنه and Ḥusayn رضي الله عنه would have a greater right than ʿAlī رضي الله عنه. As far as them being a woman or children then it should be noted that in many kingdoms women and children still rule while they are assisted by others.

In summary, even if khilāfah were to be determined through ancestry, ʿAlī رضي الله عنه would still not have the greatest right to rule and more so it would not have been his right at the time of the demise of Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم. Furthermore, it would still not have been his right when he eventually became the khalīfah, as Ḥasan رضي الله عنه and Ḥusayn رضي الله عنه were both alive at the time. However, if khilāfah is like nubuwwah and not akin to the hereditary rule of kingdoms, such that the most

qualified and most superior are chosen to rule, then what is wrong with ʿUmar رَضِيَ ٱللَّٰهُ عَنْهُ suggesting that Abū Bakr رَضِيَ ٱللَّٰهُ عَنْهُ be the khalīfah, if he had not done so then someone else would have? If Abū Bakr رَضِيَ ٱللَّٰهُ عَنْهُ was not the most superior then most certainly this objection would have merit.

Chapter two

The Promise of Succession and Authority

It is also established from the Noble Qur'ān that whatever transpired was correct and in order. If you are not convinced then here is the fourth verse:

وَعَدَ اللّٰهُ الَّذِيْنَ اٰمَنُوْا مِنْكُمْ وَ عَمِلُوا الصّٰلِحٰتِ لَيَسْتَخْلِفَنَّهُمْ فِى الْاَرْضِ كَمَا اسْتَخْلَفَ الَّذِيْنَ مِنْ قَبْلِهِمْ وَ لَيُمَكِّنَنَّ لَهُمْ دِيْنَهُمُ الَّذِى ارْتَضٰى لَهُمْ وَ لَيُبَدِّلَنَّهُمْ مِّنْۢ بَعْدِ خَوْفِهِمْ اَمْنًا ؕ يَعْبُدُوْنَنِىْ لَا يُشْرِكُوْنَ بِىْ شَيْئًا ؕ وَ مَنْ كَفَرَ بَعْدَ ذٰلِكَ فَاُولٰٓئِكَ هُمُ الْفٰسِقُوْنَ﴿۵۵﴾

> Allah has promised those of you who have īmān and who do good actions that He will definitely make them successors (rulers) on earth just as He had made those before them successors. And He will certainly grant (great) strength to the dīn that He has chosen for them and will certainly replace their fear with peace (on condition that) they worship Me and do not ascribe any as partner to Me. Those who are ungrateful after this are sinful indeed.[1]

For those who understand the Qur'ān, the purport and implication of this verse is evident. As for those who are not equipped, they may refer to one of the many translations of the Qur'an, which are freely available.

This verse contradicts Shīʿah beliefs

Take a moment to analyse this verse. The promise is specifically being made to the believers of that era and it is not a promise to Muslims in general. Since "الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا" (those who believe) is followed by "مِنْكُمْ" (from amongst you), it refers specifically to the Ṣaḥābah. The addition of "مِنْكُمْ" excludes all Muslims who were yet to come into existence. Consequently, this verse has no relationship with the authority and rule which Imām al-Mahdī will attain.

1 Sūrah al-Nūr: 55

Similarly, the promise is not made to all the believers at that time; it is a select few only and this is also established from the function of "مِنْ" (from) in the word "مِنْكُمْ" (from amongst you). This is so because when "مِنْ" (from) is attached to a personal pronoun then it either signifies *tabʿīḍ* (portioning) or *ibtidā'* (beginning). Since the option of *ibtidā'* (beginning) is unanimously ruled out, we are left with *tabʿīḍ* (portioning) because those who are eloquent and well-versed with Arabic never use "مِنْ" attached to a personal pronoun to denote *bayān* (explanation), which is the third possible function of the word "مِنْ".

If we assume for a moment that despite it being impossible for "مِنْ" to denote *bayān* (explanation), in which case we would have to momentarily disregard that the Qur'ān is the miraculous and unparalleled word of Allah Taʿālā, and instead consider this construction to be like that of some Urdu-speaking student who has only studied until *Hidāyat al-Naḥw* and committed gross grammatical errors, but still it would not solve the problem of the Shīʿah. In this instance, "مِنْكُمْ" (from amongst you) would refer to all the Ṣaḥābah including the three Khulafā, because they were classified as believers at the time of the revelation of the verse and they had not turned apostate as yet (according to the Shīʿah claim). If some of these individuals were hypocrites who had never embraced Islam at all then the verse would still refer to those whom the Shīʿah claim turned apostate after the demise of Rasūlullāh ﷺ. The Shīʿah maintain that all verses dealing with the apostates refer to these Ṣaḥābah who left the fold of Islam after the demise of Rasūlullāh ﷺ.

If this interpretation is to be considered, it would mean that Allah made a promise to these apostates that He would establish the chosen religion for them but He then went against His promise because if He established the dīn then how could their inner-selves and shayṭān lead them to apostasy? In addition to this, Allah says that when the promise would be fulfilled, they would worship Him alone without ascribing partners to Him. This phrase of the verse could either be regarded as a promise or as *khabar* (expressing a fact). Whether it be a promise or a khabar, it implies that they would remain steadfast on the path which they

were upon, i.e. īmān and righteous deeds, by virtue of which they ultimately were entitled for this reward. Those who understand the implications of the phrase:

وَعَدَ اللّٰهُ الَّذِيْنَ اٰمَنُوْا مِنْكُمْ وَ عَمِلُوا الصّٰلِحٰتِ

Allah has promised those of you who have īmān and who do good actions.

extract this meaning from the verse, i.e. that the Ṣaḥābah were being foretold of their succession and dominance on account of believing in Allah and doing righteous deeds.

Considering the meaning of the verse thus far, it makes one wonder how they became apostates. This could only signify one of two things: either Allah went against His promise or He erred in the information given,

الَّذِيْنَ اٰمَنُوْا مِنْكُمْ

Those of you who have īmān.

A false promise

Conversely, consider the meaning of this verse in the light of Shīʿī belief, and assume that "الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا مِنْكُمْ" refers to the four or five individuals who remained Muslims after the demise of Rasūlullāh ﷺ and did not turn apostate. If "مِنْ" denotes *bayān* (explanation) then it implies that the promise of succession is made to everyone of these four or five individuals since all of them embraced Islam prior to the revelation of this verse. However, it appears that the promise was fulfilled in respect of only one individual, i.e. ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. As for Abū Dhar, Salmān al-Fārsī, Bilāl, Ḥasan and Ḥusayn رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ, the promise made to them was false. The hollowness of the promise with regard to Ḥusayn رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ requires no elaboration. As for Ḥasan رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, though he did assume the role of khalīfah for six months, the promise of establishing dīn (i.e. of the Shīʿah) did not materialise at all. This is more evident according to the Shīʿah view since they maintain that Muʿāwiyah

رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, who rejected the position of imāmah of the A'immah, was in control of the khilāfah and there was no security and peace for Ḥasan رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. If this is not correct then why did he surrender the khilāfah to Muʿāwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and chose to pass his entire life in taqiyyah?

As for ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, the Ahl al-Sunnah still maintain that he had authority and dominance but this is not true according to the Shīʿah stance. This is because the Shīʿah religion remained obscure throughout his reign and he lived in taqiyyah all along. In fact, he continued to praise the first two khulafā publicly, even though they were deceased and he did not have to fear them at all. Never did he get a single opportunity to proclaim the truth and unmask his real identity. As for the promised state of security and peace, this was also not achieved according the Shīʿah, because ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was constantly in a state of fear from the 'disbelievers'. Muʿāwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was there all the time to frustrate him and he eventually snatched a considerable portion of rule away from him.

The summary of this discussion is that if the promise was made to all of them, by asserting that "مِنْ" denotes *bayān* (explanation), then the word of Allah will be left meaningless and false.

The attempt to misinterpret its meaning

If we were to consider that "مِنْ" denotes *bayān* (explanation), despite it being incorrect to attach the personal pronoun to it in this case, and then assume that *istikhlāf* (granting authority) refers to *tawaṭṭun* (granting a residence) as some Shīʿī scholars have suggested, then too the meaning of *tawaṭṭun* (granting a residence) cannot be established. This is because istikhlāf is attached to the clause "في الأرض" and it can only imply authority and dominance over the land, and not a residence. Similarly, "Those who do good actions" would then have no relevance because residence on earth is enjoyed equally by the righteous and the transgressors. In fact, the transgressors have more advantages in this matter. Moreover, "Those who believe" would also be redundant since there is no shortage of disbelievers enjoying the benefit of residency on earth.

Nevertheless, they have subjected the word of Allah to such futile interpretations in order to avert the consequences of this verse, but the Qur'ān is far beyond such foolishness.

The verse denotes dominance and authority

Refusing to surrender, some Shīʿī scholars have said that, "Those who believe and do good actions" refers to ʿAlī رضي الله عنه and the plural form has been employed to signify his exaltedness. If not, then it refers to him and his progeny. Assuming that this interpretation has any credibility despite it being incorrect to state that the plural form refers to an individual when there is no need for such an interpretation, and despite it being forbidden to change the plural meaning to an individual one when the plural meaning has validity, then too we would say that none of these people, ʿAlī رضي الله عنه or his progeny, ever enjoyed a state of security and peace as they all lived under taqiyyah.

Therefore, the function of "مِنْ" (from) can only be *tabʿīḍ* (portioning) and istikhlāf can only denote authority and dominance on earth. Since "Those who believe and do good actions" is plural, it requires three individuals at least (namely Abū Bakr, ʿUmar and ʿUthmān رضي الله عنهم) but if a fourth is added to it (ʿAlī رضي الله عنه) it could certainly accommodate it.

We have thus established the meaning of this verse as follows: Allah Taʿālā has promised the Ṣaḥābah that at least three individuals amongst them, who possess īmān and do righteous deeds, would definitely assume authority and control on earth; Allah will establish that dīn for them which He has preferred for them and throughout their period of rule, the dīn will suffer no deficiency. Allah will change their condition to one of security and stability after the period of fear they experienced from the enemy. The phrase that follows this could either be a continuation of the promise or it could be foretelling a future event. Either way, it implies that despite enjoying the benefits of authority and leadership and the challenges that come with it, they will continue to worship Allah sincerely and devotedly, without becoming victims of shirk and rebellion.

The correct tafsīr of this verse

It is my humble assertion to the Shīʿī scholars that the promise of Allah can never be false and invalid. Therefore, the individuals to whom this promise was fulfilled necessarily possessed the above mentioned qualities and by the testimony of Allah they certainly had perfect īmān and acceptable good deeds. In fact, these individuals surpassed their contemporaries in these two traits (i.e. īmān and good deeds) because the reward was promised on the basis of these two traits and it is only logical for it to be conferred to those who excel in these traits. If not, then Allah forbid, this would attribute injustice to Allah, since it implies that the one who was unqualified enjoyed the reward.

According to the view of the Ahl al-Sunnah, Allah is at liberty to do as He wishes and He has the authority to give what rightfully belongs to one person to another but his wisdom is so perfect that He always grants the benefits to those who are deserving of it. This is the precise implication of the verse which states that Allah does not oppress anyone in anyway. Similarly, Allah Taʿālā says:

اَعْطٰى كُلَّ شَيْءٍ خَلْقَهٗ ثُمَّ هَدٰى

> He Who granted each thing its (appropriate) form and then guided it.[1]

Allah creates everything in proportion and with specific dimensions and characteristics and then directs it to fulfil appropriate functions and purposes. However, the Shīʿah maintain that Allah is deprived of the free will of doing as He pleases and justice is incumbent and binding upon Him. Considering their view it would mean that there was absolutely no possibility of anyone surpassing the three khulafā in the two traits stated above. Instead they surpassed and excelled the rest of the Ṣaḥābah.

1 Sūrah Ṭāhā: 50

The sequence of khilāfah is also established from this verse

The natural implication of the above discussion would be that from the three khulafā, the individual who surpassed his colleagues in these two traits should precede them in assuming authority. This correlation is necessary so that recognition is given on the basis of merit and achievement. Therefore, since this promise was fulfilled to the al-Khulafā al-Rāshidīn, and it was fulfilled in a particular sequence, it serves as a testimony from Allah that the four khulafā surpassed the rest of the Ṣaḥābah in īmān and good deeds. It also testifies that whilst they were alive, nobody else was more deserving of assuming authority and that the sequence by which they assumed their roles establishes their distinction and merit as far as īmān and good deeds are concerned. Therefore, the first of them achieved the highest position, then the second and the third to be khalīfah was third in rank and so on.

This verse refers to the four Rightly Guided Khulafā

Whilst Ḥasan رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ is considered to be among the Rightly Guided Khulafā, his khilāfah is not associated with the promised authority contained in this verse. This is because he was a child when this verse was revealed and he did not experience the fear referred to in this verse. It is the seniors who had apprehension of harm from the enemy, not the minors. Instead, his inclusion among the Rightly Guided Khulafā is separate from the promise which was fulfilled to the four khulafā. This is why his khilāfah did not require establishment of authority otherwise referred to as *tamkīn*

As for Muʿāwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, who did achieve establishment of authority, it was a political authority and not a religious authority. Those who are well-versed with history are aware of the considerable difference between the nature and circumstances of the first four khulafā and that of Muʿāwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ. Whilst they were abstemious and simple, the manner of Muʿāwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ was more similar to the ways of pious kings and men of power and influence. This is why despite him being an illustrious Ṣaḥābī, the Ahl al-Sunnah maintain that he did not qualify to the status of a khalīfah (with the full implications this word carries), but he was

more of a pious king and righteous ruler. However, all kings are not the same; consider the difference between Anusherwan and Genghis Khan.

By saying that he resembled a king, it means that if he were compared to the Rightly Guided Khulafā then he would be considered a worldly ruler. This is similar to the manner in which Nabī Sulaimān عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ is considered to be a man of wealth and affluence, as opposed to the rest of the ambiyā'. By this classification of Muʿāwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ it should not be inferred that he was like common worldly rulers; oppressive, tyrannical and unscrupulous. On the contrary, his tolerance and compassion for his subjects, and service to them is well documented in history.

In addition to this, he cannot be listed along with the Rightly Guided Khulafā because he was not among those who lived in fear of the disbelievers and suffered insecurity. This condition only passed upon the initial muhājirīn to Madīnah Munawwarah, and even Ḥasan ibn ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ did not witness this period. The fear and hardship which the four Rightly Guided Khulafā experienced was not witnessed by others and these facts are recorded in the books of history.

This is why they received the reward and the promise was fulfilled for them exclusively. Their state of fear was brought about due to their accepting īmān and doing righteous deeds and it was only on account of these two matters that they became victims of the enmity of the disbelievers. Similarly, the enmity of the disbelievers was proportionate to the intensity of their faith and their quality of their righteous deeds. Their intensity of faith and good deeds determined the degree of fear they were subjected to. Love for Allah and devotion to him is tested in times of fear and suppression, and this is the criterion for measuring devotion to Allah. So whoever is subjected to greater fear is subjected to it on the basis of excelling in īmān and righteous deeds.

Nevertheless, it is established that the period of fear was specifically experienced by the first muhājirīn and that Ḥasan رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and Muʿāwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ did not witness this test. As for Ḥasan رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, he was an infant whilst Muʿāwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was not yet a Muslim.

The basis of this verse is the sacrifices of the muhājirīn

If one were to ponder over the meaning of this verse he would learn that the only reason for this promise is that the Ṣaḥābah of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, especially the muhājirīn, despite their lack of provisions and small number in the early years of Islam, opposed a much larger group of the kuffār, all in search of Allah's pleasure and the establishment of dīn. In so doing they created enemies with this larger group and as a result had to endure untold torture, abuse and persecution. They lived in fear for many years, such that a time soon came when their homes no longer remained safe-havens and they were forced to leave everything they held dear and migrate to another land. This too did not satisfy the kuffār and many battles ensued thereafter, wherein many of the muhājirīn and the anṣār were martyred. Once they were thoroughly tested by Allah Taʿālā, His immense Mercy knew no bounds and Allah Taʿālā resolved to reward them in this world as well. In recompense for all the difficulties and hardships they had to endure, Allah Taʿālā showered his bounties upon them and granted them peace and comfort. On account of the kuffār having authority over them, which was the principle cause of all the hardships and persecution, Allah Taʿālā granted them the khilāfah. On account of the kuffār having authority over them, fasts, ṣalāh and praises of Allah could not be made, which resulted in them having to bear anguish in their hearts, in fact this too was the reason for their exile. In recompense for this sacrifice, Allah Taʿālā established His dīn for them and fear was replaced with peace. This explanation should make it clear that the Ahl al-Bayt of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ undoubtedly have a unique virtue but this virtue alone does not make them deserving of khilāfah, this is the fruit of the very sacrifice mentioned above.

This verse also reveals the secret behind khilāfah being reserved for the Quraish

The reason for khilāfah being reserved for the Quraish is also learnt from this verse. In other words, the meaning of the ḥadīth, which advocates that the right of khilāfah belongs to the Quraish and the anṣār have no right to it, is learnt from this verse. The reason for this is that Khilāfah is in actual fact a reward

and recompense for the sacrifices of the muhājirīn, and since the muhājirīn are from the Quraish, khilāfah should be restricted to them. However the positions of assistance such as that of the qāḍī, etc, can be held by the anṣār. This also makes it clear that the khilāfah attained by Ḥasan رضي الله عنه and Muʿāwiyah رضي الله عنه was not the fulfilment of the promise made in this verse. In addition, it is also clear to those of understanding and the fair-minded that whatever laws of dīn came to the fore or became common practice during the reign of these khulafā, such as Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه not handing over Fadak to Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها, ʿUmar رضي الله عنه prohibiting Mutā and establishing Tarāwīḥ and ʿUthmān رضي الله عنه adding another adhān to the Jumuʿāh ṣalāh; are all desired by dīn and a realisation of the verse:

دِيْنَهُمُ الَّذِى ارْتَضٰى لَهُمْ

> And He will certainly grant (great) strength to the dīn that He has chosen for them.

In a similar manner, whatever ruling they come to consensus and agreement on, it is without a doubt correct and whoever discards it has discarded the dīn chosen by Allah and whoever denies it, denies the truth.

This verse proves the innocence of ʿUmar رضي الله عنه

Furthermore, aside from the sentence:

وَعَدَ اللّٰهُ الَّذِيْنَ اٰمَنُوْا مِنْكُمْ وَ عَمِلُوا الصّٰلِحٰتِ لَيَسْتَخْلِفَنَّهُمْ فِى الْاَرْضِ

> Allah has promised those of you who have īmān and who do good actions that He will definitely make them successors (rulers) on earth.

being a clear proof for the legitimacy of the khilāfah of the first three khulafā, it also totally annihilates the Shīʿah presumption that ʿUmar رضي الله عنه prevented Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم from writing the declaration for ʿAlī رضي الله عنه as khalīfah in his final illness. Those with perception will understand that the words:

وَ لَيُمَكِّنَنَّ لَهُمْ دِيْنَهُمُ الَّذِى ارْتَضٰى لَهُمْ

> And He will certainly grant (great) strength to the dīn that He has chosen for them.

removes any possibility of this because when the khilāfah of the first three khulafā is the promised khilāfah then the establishment of their khilāfah will be the establishment of the dīn chosen by Allah. With certainty, if khilāfah were not a matter of dīn, then this substantiation would not have been possible. Thus, the Shīʿah cannot deny this as then they will have to declare ʿAlī رضي الله عنه and his progeny to be desirous of worldly possessions, Allah forbid. In essence, this accusation and many others which the Shīʿah and Khawārij make against the al-Khulafā al-Rāshidīn, on account of their misconceptions will be refuted. Even though all these accusations, according to those with foresight, are the result of flawed understanding. Allah willing, this will become more apparent in the discussion on Fadak which will be discussed shortly. It might not have been necessary to discuss the incident of the pen and paper at this juncture, as it is out of place and has no link to the actual discussion, but since it is one of the major accusations that the Shīʿah make against the al-Khulafā al-Rāshidīn, I will elaborate on it briefly, based upon the principle that if the primary evidence is shattered then the case itself has ended.

The reasons why the order of Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم could not be fulfilled

Firstly, it is not mentioned in any narration that ʿUmar رضي الله عنه was the person who prevented the pen and paper from being brought. In fact, when Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم asked for it, then ʿUmar رضي الله عنه was amongst many who were in the room at the time. They differed as to what the cause of action should be; some said the instruction should be carried out and others felt that Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم should not be put into any further pain. As a result of this difference of opinions, much shouting erupted. ʿUmar رضي الله عنه was of the opinion that this instruction was not one of obligation but rather out of concern and compassion for the Ummah, as Allah Taʿālā had already previously said:

اَلْيَوْمَ اَكْمَلْتُ لَكُمْ دِيْنَكُمْ وَاَتْمَمْتُ عَلَيْكُمْ نِعْمَتِىْ وَرَضِيْتُ لَكُمُ الْاِسْلَامَ دِيْنًا

> Today I have perfected your dīn for you, completed My bounty upon you and chosen Islam as your religion.[1]

Since Allah has perfected and completed the dīn of Islam, this is no new matter of dīn that needs to be written nor any further elaboration of any law. It is not anything fundamental that requires writing at that precise moment, rendering it compulsory to write, but instead it was the concern and care of Rasūlullāh ﷺ that prompted him to make this request. So when Rasūlullāh ﷺ showed such concern for us in such a time of difficulty then is it not befitting that we too show the same concern for him in his pain and distress? In fact, etiquette would necessitate that it not be considered and the moment be allowed to pass. If a father in a time of extreme hunger were to hand over his portion of food to his son and urge him to eat, then would it be appropriate for the son to show no concern for his father and consume it greedily? Instead in such a time, etiquette would demand that the son not listen to his father and regard his 'disobedience' to be a means of his own salvation. It is for this reason and also so that the noise would be put to an end that he said:

حسبنا كتاب الله

> The Qur'ān is sufficient for us.

So then why is there a need to cause harm to Rasūlullāh ﷺ in this manner? If some narration in some rare volume that proves beyond any doubt that ʿUmar رضي الله عنه was the first person to make this objection were to be presented by some Shīʿah then aside from whether that narration is authentic or not and not some fabrication, it will have no bearing on account of the reasons stated above. Nevertheless, this accusation is based upon lack of understanding, poor insight and obtuseness. When one peruses through the outcome of this event then he will conclude that ʿUmar رضي الله عنه was indeed correct. When the noise level

1 Sūrah al-Mā'idah: 3

increased, Rasūlullāh ﷺ addressed the entire congregation, asking them all to leave. If this were a divine instruction, compulsory or incumbent, then Rasūlullāh ﷺ would have repeated his instruction with more authority. In a similar manner if the noise was not the reason for Rasūlullāh's ﷺ distress, as understood by ʿUmar رضي الله عنه, then he would have never asked them all to leave.

The weight of Umar's رضي الله عنه opinion

It can also be said that just as on many occasions the opinion of ʿUmar رضي الله عنه, even though contrary to that of Rasūlullāh ﷺ, was in accordance with the opinion of Allah Taʿālā, resulting in *wahī* (revelation) descending in agreement with his opinion, here too the opinion of ʿUmar رضي الله عنه was in accordance with the opinion of Allah. If this were not the case then just as when the kuffār would question Rasūlullāh ﷺ and wahī would descend affirming the word of Rasūlullāh ﷺ, so would it have descended here as well, affirming the instruction of Rasūlullāh ﷺ. Unquestionably, this much still remains that in this instance no wahī descended affirming the opinion of Umar رضي الله عنه either perhaps after affirming his opinion approximately sixteen times previously, it was regarded to be sufficient and therefore on this one occasion wahī did not descend. Furthermore, in light of the verse:

اَلْيَوْمَ اَكْمَلْتُ لَكُمْ دِيْنَكُمْ وَاَتْمَمْتُ عَلَيْكُمْ نِعْمَتِيْ وَرَضِيْتُ لَكُمُ الْاِسْلَامَ دِيْنًا

> Today I have perfected your dīn for you, completed My bounty upon you and chosen Islam as your religion.

This was not any necessary law of dīn, as already discussed. In addition, this was the final moments of the life of Rasūlullāh ﷺ, a time where all attention and focus is directed to Allah, how then would it have been appropriate to occupy Rasūlullāh ﷺ with something that was not compulsory. Thus, even though revelation did not descend affirming the opinion of ʿUmar رضي الله عنه and the truth of his words, these accusations still do not have any basis. The words of ʿUmar رضي الله عنه are worthy of praise from any person having sound intellect.

ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was not the one instructed to bring the pen and paper

If any person still finds it hard to accept, on account of his own prejudice, that Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ asked for the pen and paper out of concern for this ummah and still regards this instruction to have been compulsory to obey, then the accusation will not fall on ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ alone but all of the Ahl al-Bayt and all the Ṣaḥābah will be equally guilty. In fact, the Ahl al-Bayt will be the most guilty since any instruction or prohibition of a sick person is firstly directed to his household. ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was a guest, who had come to visit for a moment or two. If there was any fear for him then they could have waited until he left and there was no one to prevent them from fulfilling the order. Moreover, Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ lived a few days after this, and if this instruction had been compulsory, as the hearts of the Shīʿah so desire, then it would make Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ the most guilty, Allah forbid, because just as it is incumbent upon us to obey Allah and His Rasūl, it is more incumbent upon the Nabī to propagate the laws of dīn. Allah Taʿālā says:

يٰاَيُّهَا الرَّسُوْلُ بَلِّغْ مَآ اُنْزِلَ اِلَيْكَ مِنْ رَّبِّكَ ؕ وَ اِنْ لَّمْ تَفْعَلْ فَمَا بَلَّغْتَ رِسَالَتَهٗ ؕ

> O Rasūl صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ! Propagate what (everything that) has been revealed to you from your Rabb. If you do not do so, then you have not conveyed Allah's message.[1]

The verses of the Qur'ān and aḥādīth of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ all attest to the same, which is why we can say without any doubt that the propagation of the laws of dīn is more incumbent upon the nabī than us practicing upon on it. It is also evident that the propagation of dīn will only be fulfilled when it is propagated in words. Simply asking for a pen and paper to be brought and having it written, that if you act on this then you will not go astray, will not fulfil the obligation of propagation. If in this case there was any sort of shortcoming from ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ then too his obedience to Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ will not have been tainted. If the Shīʿah will ascribe such shortcomings to Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and the Ahl al-Bayt,

1 Sūrah al-Mā'idah: 67

Allah forbid, then we too have no qualms of ʿUmar ﵁ being included with them.

Where did the Shīʿah learn of the intention of Rasūlullāh ﷺ

How did the Shīʿah conclude from Rasūlullāh ﷺ asking for a pen and paper that he desired to write a decree in favour of ʿAlī ﵁ as khalīfah? The apparent wording of Rasūlullāh ﷺ suggests that he wished write such a summary of the tenets of Islam that would serve as a fortress for the īmān of Muslims or list those practices which are absolutely essential in dīn, after all Rasūlullāh ﷺ did say: "If you practice upon it then I bear witness that you will never go astray." Signalling a particular person out for the khilāfah will not fulfil the condition stipulated, which is obvious. This only prompts far-fetched and impossible interpretations, which any person is capable of doing. Even if we were to hypothetically accept that this was a decree making the khilāfah of ʿAlī ﵁ incumbent upon all, then for how long was this to last? No mention is made of anyone after ʿAlī ﵁ whereas the narrations clearly state that you will never go astray ever after that. Let us say, hypothetically, that this was a decree for khilāfah; where does it state that it was for ʿAlī ﵁? Rasūlullāh ﷺ had left both logical and verbal proof for the khilāfah of Abū Bakr ﵁. If you ask where the verbal proof is then it can be found in the Ṣiḥāḥ Sittah[1] of the Ahl al-Sunnah, where Rasūlullāh ﷺ said:

> I desired to write in favour of Abū Bakr ﵁ so that no desirous person may desire but Allah will not be pleased with anyone besides Abū Bakr ﵁ and nor will the mu'minīn.

The khilāfah of Abū Bakr ﵁ will be the most logical conclusion

This narration establishes that if Rasūlullāh ﷺ did intend to make a decree regarding the khilāfah then it would have been in favour of Abū Bakr ﵁ and not ʿAlī ﵁. If you ask what is the logical proof then listen well. According to

1 Bukhārī, Muslim, Tirmidhī, Abū Dāwūd, Nasā'ī, and Ibn Mājah

the norm, Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم must have been aware that ʿAlī رضي الله عنه might have been hopeful of being his successor and his other relatives and close family would have endeavoured for the same, which would result in this right never reaching the one deserving of it, i.e. Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه. On the other hand such hopes would not have occurred to Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه, according to all people of intellect, nor is there any proof of it or even a hint. If such hopes are proven then it is proven to have been from ʿAlī رضي الله عنه, which is why Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم was so perplexed and worried. Thus to the good fortune of the Shīʿah, this thinking of Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم turned out to be correct and ʿAlī رضي الله عنه still remained a candidate for the khilāfah and the prediction of Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم also turned out to be true; Allah and the mu'minīn were not pleased with anyone but Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه. In summary, if the name of anyone was to be written as khalīfah then it was the name of Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه that was going to be written. If anyone has the right to complain against ʿUmar رضي الله عنه then it should be Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه, why do the Shīʿah complain? It is as the saying goes:

> They always see two and two equalling to four loaves bread
> And a cat only sees birds in his dreams

Thus the Shīʿah, regardless of what the context may be, will always see the khilāfah of ʿAlī رضي الله عنه and the A'immah.

This was just mentioned by the way. Our actual discussion was that the words:

وَ لَيُمَكِّنَنَّ لَهُمْ دِيْنَهُمُ الَّذِى ارْتَضٰى لَهُمْ

> And He will certainly grant (great) strength to the dīn that He has chosen for them.

replies all objections raised against the four al-Khulafā al-Rāshidīn. In short, this verse establishes the legitimacy of the khilāfah of the first three khulafā and also makes apparent their virtue, status and piety. This in itself proves the veracity of the Ahl al-Sunnah and the falsehood and deviation of the Shīʿah.

This bounty was in actual fact granted to the four khulafā and it is through them that it was attained by others

In order to emphasise my point further, I wish to add that the pronoun "لهم" (for them) indicates that the desired dīn will be established by those who will be appointed as khalīfah and this great bounty will be first granted to the khulafā and through them others will benefit from it. They will be the primary recipients and others will attest to it. However since this could not be understood by the Shīʿah merely from the words:

وَ لَيُمَكِّنَنَّ

> And He will certainly grant (great) strength to the dīn...

Allah added the pronoun:

لَهُمْ

> ...for them.

This establishes that even if others were to render services to dīn, it would all be in assistance to them. Thus in whichever manner the desired dīn was established, however fear was transformed into peace; it was all on account of these four khulafā. Just as when a president is invited to a feast, his close attendants are also invited on account of him and they partake of the same food as the president. The difference between the two will be the honour awarded to the president.

In this case too, this great bounty was awarded to these four khulafā specifically but through them all the Ṣaḥābah were encompassed by it. Every Ṣaḥābī, whether poor or bedouin was granted authority and leadership over the kuffār accordingly. In summary, this bounty of khilāfah was specifically for these four beloveds of Allah but all shared in its fruits and all the Ṣaḥābah shared in the favours mentioned in this verse, through the blessings of the four al-Khulafā al-

Rāshidīn. The Ṣaḥābah are the example of the close attendants of the president and whoever had already embraced Islam at the time when this verse was revealed, such as the forerunners of the muhājirīn, who are the closest of all and in fact akin to a blood brother. The tābiʿīn are like the servants and bodyguards of the president and even though all shared in this bounty, the difference will be the honour that was awarded to the khulafā.

"Those who are ungrateful..." refers to the ingratitude of the Shīʿah and is a miracle of the Qur'ān

It is also apparent that when the attendants and relatives benefit from the favours showered upon the president then the president need not be thankful and grateful towards them, instead it is the servants and attendants who should express their gratitude towards the president. The ungrateful and bitter instead of expressing their gratitude for the bounties they have enjoyed will always remain scornful and rather throw thorns in the path of the president.

The same applies here with the great bounty of khilāfah, whatever victories, success and growth of Islam occurred from the era of the al-Khulafā al-Rāshidīn to this day, are all the fruits of their khilāfah. However, since these fruits were going to be enjoyed by the Ṣaḥābah as well as the Muslims of present day and even by the kuffār until the present day, Allah Taʿālā wished to distinguish the status of these four khulafā from that of their enemies, and so He said:

وَ مَنْ كَفَرَ بَعْدَ ذٰلِكَ فَاُولٰٓئِكَ هُمُ الْفٰسِقُوْنَ

Those who are ungrateful after this are sinful indeed.

In other words, whoever benefits from this bounty, bestowed through these four khulafā and do not recognise the source of it, showing ingratitude and even worse yet disrespect, then they are the true sinners and no other sinner can equal them. It is obvious that the final portion of this verse fits no other but the Shīʿah, Khawārij, Nawāṣib, the murderer of ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, as well as the murderers

of ʿUthmān and ʿAlī رضي الله عنهما. However since the Shīʿah are the enemies of those who are the primary source of this bounty, the sin resting on their shoulders, on account of their ungratefulness, will be greater that any of the other sects.

Muʿāwiyah رضي الله عنه and a few other Ṣaḥābah did oppose ʿAlī رضي الله عنه but their opposition was like the disagreement between two brothers. Their example and that of the four khulafā will be like that of rich brothers and poor brothers, that despite their disagreements with each other they all benefit from the rich brother. In essence, failing to express gratitude while still appreciating the generosity of the affluent brother, is not commonly termed to be ingratitude but rather pride instead. In this instance, whereby all the brothers benefit from the success of one, the graceful act would be for the affluent brother not to become arrogant and spiteful towards those whom he aids. In fact, even if the other brothers were to harm him or show ingratitude towards him, it would still befit him to be gracious and not seek retribution from them and still regard them to be his brothers at the end of the day.

In summary, it is the practice of the people of righteousness that they do not harm their brothers who show ingratitude towards them but rather whatever Allah Taʿālā grants them of worldly and spiritual bounties, they appreciate and do not become boastful. In fact, they act the opposite to those who show ingratitude and instead become more generous. However, if the servant or attendant persists with his insults and hurtful sentiments then he most definitely becomes deserving of punishment.

The Shīʿah have abandoned the fundamental rules of Shīʿasm and discarded obedience to ʿAlī رضي الله عنه. Instead they have opted to follow in the footsteps of Muʿāwiyah رضي الله عنه. The reason for this is that when ʿAlī رضي الله عنه was informed that the companions of Muʿāwiyah رضي الله عنه were cursing them, ʿAlī رضي الله عنه prohibited his army from cursing Muʿāwiyah رضي الله عنه. This is reported in the most recognised Shīʿah works as well, but sadly the Shīʿah have opted to follow Muʿāwiyah رضي الله عنه instead and made *tabarrā* (absolving themselves) from the Ṣaḥābah their unique trait.

Most certainly they have not followed the practice of ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ of not speaking ill of others but then where was he theirs to follow in the first place; following the Sunnah of ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ is the practice of the Ahl al-Sunnah.

Subhān Allāh, what a miraculous verse that it has not left any aspect uncovered. Allah Taʿālā made a promise to the Ṣaḥābah and thereafter hinted towards, or rather clearly mentioned their virtues, also reprimanding those who oppose the Ṣaḥābah and then too in such a manner that the description fits them from head to toe.

This verse draws a tight circle around the virtue of the Ṣaḥābah, protecting it from all sides

Undoubtedly if the following words were not mentioned:

يَعْبُدُوْنَنِىْ لَا يُشْرِكُوْنَ بِىْ شَيْئًا

> They worship Me and do not ascribe any as partner to Me.

And the words "after this" did not appear following the statement, "Those who are ungrateful", then there would be scope for interpreting the verse to mean that after the demise of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, the Ṣaḥābah turned apostate (as per Shīʿah belief) and that this verse refers to real kufr (i.e. disbelief) and not showing ingratitude for the bounties of Allah. However, Allah Taʿālā has not left anything to pass in his Book.

The people of intelligence have already understood that such īmān and deeds, which are beloved to Allah and which passed the test with such success that Allah awarded them great bounties on account of it; it is impossible that such īmān could ever change into kufr, since such īmān is only the lot of the "Sincere Slaves", regarding whom shayṭān was forced to admit:

قَالَ فَبِعِزَّتِكَ لَأُغْوِيَنَّهُمْ اَجْمَعِيْنَ ﴿٨٢﴾ اِلَّا عِبَادَكَ مِنْهُمُ الْمُخْلَصِيْنَ ﴿٨٣﴾

> He (Iblīs) said: "I swear by Your honour! I shall definitely mislead all of them except your sincere slaves amongst them."[1]

And Allah has also declared:

اِنَّ عِبَادِیْ لَیْسَ لَکَ عَلَیْهِمْ سُلْطٰنٌ

> Indeed you will have no power over My bondsmen.[2]

In fact, it is from the Noble Qur'ān that we come to understand that these "Sincere Slaves " are either *maḥfūẓ* (protected) from sin or are *maʿsūm* (infallible or incapable) of sin.

The reason for this is the following verse:

کَذٰلِکَ لِنَصْرِفَ عَنْهُ السُّوْٓءَ وَالْفَحْشَآءَ ؕ اِنَّهٗ مِنْ عِبَادِنَا الْمُخْلَصِیْنَ ﴿۲۴﴾

> In this manner We averted evil and immorality from him. Indeed he was from Our sincere bondsmen.[3]

And since it has just been mentioned that the four khulafā are also from the "Sincere Slaves" of Allah, who are either *mahfūẓ* (protected) from sin or are *maʿsūm* (infallible or incapable) of sin, then how is it possible for the words "Those who are ungrateful after this" to apply to them?

Thereafter, for those of lesser understanding, Allah added:

وَ لَیُمَکِّنَنَّ لَهُمْ دِیْنَهُمُ الَّذِی ارْتَضٰی لَهُمْ

> And He will certainly grant (great) strength to the dīn that He has chosen for them.

1 Sūrah Ṣād: 82

2 Sūrah al-Ḥijr: 42

3 Sūrah Yūsuf: 24

So that they do not pollute their tongues and minds by running down the Ṣaḥābah, which will result in them destroying their dīn and īmān, and on account of their cursing the Ṣaḥābah earn the curse of Allah in return.

Furthermore, to make the explanation even clearer for the truly dull and ignorant, Allah mentioned further:

يَعْبُدُوْنَنِيْ لَا يُشْرِكُوْنَ بِيْ شَيْئًا

They worship Me and do not ascribe any as partner to Me.

So that any further doubt of apostasy can also be removed, and on account of their warped understanding and low aptitude should not apply the next portion of "Those who are ungrateful after this" to the Ṣaḥābah.

With certainty, the verse:

يَعْبُدُوْنَنِيْ لَا يُشْرِكُوْنَ بِيْ شَيْئًا

They worship Me and do not ascribe any as partner to Me.

has completely uprooted any possibility of apostasy, which by assuming the impossible might have occurred, since this verse mentions their condition till the end of their lives.

The qualities which Allah has mentioned have been found to be prevalent to the highest degree in the four khulafā, to such an extent that the Shīʿah themselves are forced to acknowledge the fact that the first three khulafā, especially ʿUmar رضي الله عنه, followed the laws of Sharīʿah to the letter and made tremendous efforts to spread the dīn. Undoubtedly they surpassed all in taqwā and *zuhd* (abstinence).

Sharīf al-Murtaḍā (a renowned Shīʿī scholar) in his book *Tanzīḥ al-Ambiyā' wa l-A'immah* and many other Shīʿī scholars as well have also written the same.

Although they have not desisted from their usual evil practice and as the saying goes:

المرء يقيس على نفسه

One judges others according to his own standard.

They claim that all of this was only done as a show. However, when we read the verse, "They worship Me" and the words before it, it all points to their sincerity.

Thus, this false accusation returns directly back to them.

Accusing the first three khulafā of apostasy is tantamount to accusing Allah of deceit

The words "after this" has utterly disgraced the Imāmiyyah sect (the Shīʿah) because, if by assuming the impossible, we suppose that the three khulafā had turned apostate after the demise of Rasūlullāh ﷺ, as the Shīʿah assume, then it would mean (Allah forbid) that Allah did not even understand as much as the Shīʿah understood.

Instead of saying: "Those who disbelieve after the demise of Nabī ﷺ", He rather chose to say: "Those who are ungrateful after this" and is thus responsible for deceit.

If however the statement: "Those who are ungrateful after this" is correct then it lends no support to the meaning which the Shīʿah attempt to extract from this verse. Instead it will contradict what they are saying because if this applies to the three khulafā, for example, then this will mean that the kufr occurred after the promised favour of Allah had been completed.

In this instance, denial or rejection of the imāmah of ʿAlī رضي الله عنه immediately after the demise of Rasūlullāh ﷺ (which according to the Shīʿah, all of the

Ṣaḥābah are guilty of, more so the first three khulafā) does not constitute kufr. The reason being that, firstly this notion of the Shīʿah that rejecting the imāmah is tantamount to the rejection of nubuwwah and constitutes kufr is absolutely baseless.

Secondly, it will mean that rejecting the right of the three khulafā to khilāfah, which has been established from this verse, will in fact constitute kufr. In this case we have no problem.

Who does "Those who are ungrateful after this" refer to?

The context of this verse informs us that the correct meaning is that the words: "Those who are ungrateful after this" actually refers to the enemies of the khulafā and not the khulafā themselves.

In addition, the word "kufr" employed in this verse refers to ingratitude for this bounty and not kufr which means disbelief, unless we laboriously endeavour to grant it that meaning.

The reason why its meaning is ingratitude in this context is that mention is made here of the person who witnesses all these favours of Allah in the form of unseen assistance to the dīn from the side of Allah, and thereafter commits "kufr" then such a person is a true transgressor, so normally ingratitude is used when a favour is discussed and not disbelief.

In short, "Those who are ungrateful after this" applies to the enemies of the khulafā, but we have given some concession and have taken "kufr" to mean ingratitude, and if the Shīʿah are not pleased with this concession and insist on taking the meaning of disbelief and thereby regard themselves as true disbelievers, then by all means they may go ahead and do as they please.

Chapter three

The lofty status of the Ṣaḥābah in the light of the verse of Sūrah al-Fatḥ

At this juncture, it is possible that some of the Shīʿah might present the following argument:

> We accept that the three Khulafā were on the truth and in their respective eras they were the most virtuous, however when the khilāfah of ʿAlī رضي الله عنه arrived then ʿAlī رضي الله عنه was the most virtuous and the rightful khalīfah, as per the verse discussed above:
>
> وَعَدَ اللّٰهُ الَّذِيْنَ اٰمَنُوْا مِنْكُمْ وَ عَمِلُوا الصّٰلِحٰتِ لَيَسْتَخْلِفَنَّهُمْ فِى الْاَرْضِ كَمَا اسْتَخْلَفَ الَّذِيْنَ مِنْ قَبْلِهِمْ وَ لَيُمَكِّنَنَّ لَهُمْ دِيْنَهُمُ الَّذِى ارْتَضٰى لَهُمْ وَ لَيُبَدِّلَنَّهُمْ مِّنْ بَعْدِ خَوْفِهِمْ اَمْنًا ۚ يَعْبُدُوْنَنِىْ لَا يُشْرِكُوْنَ بِىْ شَيْئًا ۚ وَ مَنْ كَفَرَ بَعْدَ ذٰلِكَ فَاُولٰٓئِكَ هُمُ الْفٰسِقُوْنَ ﴿٥٥﴾
>
> Allah has promised those of you who have īmān and who do good actions that He will definitely make them successors (rulers) on earth just as He had made those before them successors. And He will certainly grant (great) strength to the Dīn that He has chosen for them and will certainly replace their fear with peace (on condition that) they worship Me and do not ascribe any as partner to Me. Those who are ungrateful after this are sinful indeed.[1]
>
> The Ahl al-Sunnah also believe and accept this. Therefore, in this instance, we do not understand how his opponents can also be accepted servants in the court of Allah. We find the Ahl al-Sunnah accepting all of the Ṣaḥābah, whether they opposed ʿAlī رضي الله عنه or not, especially Ṭalḥah and Zubayr رضي الله عنهما. The Ahl al-Sunnah also regard ʿĀ'ishah رضي الله عنها to have been given glad tidings of Jannah.

Thus, it is necessary that the testimony of Allah in favour of the Ṣaḥābah be explained and the misconceptions of the Shīʿah be cleared.

1 Sūrah al-Nūr: 55

In Sūrah al-Fatḥ, Allah has praised and lauded Rasūlullāh ﷺ and the Ṣaḥābah in the following manner:

مُحَمَّدٌ رَّسُوْلُ اللّٰهِ ؕ وَ الَّذِيْنَ مَعَهٗۤ اَشِدَّآءُ عَلَى الْكُفَّارِ رُحَمَآءُ بَيْنَهُمْ تَرٰىهُمْ رُكَّعًا سُجَّدًا يَّبْتَغُوْنَ
فَضْلًا مِّنَ اللّٰهِ وَ رِضْوَانًا ؗ سِيْمَاهُمْ فِيْ وُجُوْهِهِمْ مِّنْ اَثَرِ السُّجُوْدِ ؕ

> Muḥammad ﷺ is Allah's Rasūl and those with him (the Ṣaḥābah) are stern against the kuffār and compassionate among themselves. You will see them sometimes bowing, sometimes prostrating; seeking Allah's bounty and His pleasure. Their hallmark (by which they are recognised) is their faces bear the marks of prostration.[1]

The crux of this verse is that Muḥammad ﷺ is the Rasūl of Allah, his servant and messenger; he is not a magician or fortune-teller. His companions are severe and firm against the kuffār and are soft and compassionate to each other, you will see them bowing in rukūʿ and prostrating in sajdah. Their objective always is the pleasure of Allah. There are signs on their foreheads due to the effects of their prostration.

The loftiest status after Rasūlullāh ﷺ is that of the Ṣaḥābah, and the status after risālat is that of "hating for the sake of Allah"

This was the meaning of the verse, now listen to the explanation of its purport by this unworthy one. Firstly, Allah praised Rasūlullāh ﷺ and thereafter Allah praised the Ṣaḥābah. So we understand and can conclude from this that the Ṣaḥābah hold the loftiest rank in this Ummah after Rasūlullāh ﷺ.

Similarly the descriptive quality used in praise of Rasūlullāh ﷺ was risālat, which is the loftiest quality, and thereafter the descriptive quality used when praising the Ṣaḥābah will accordingly be the loftiest quality thereafter. Here we notice that Allah used the word "Rasūlullāh" when describing Nabī Muḥammad

1 Sūrah al-Fatḥ: 29

صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ but when describing the Ṣaḥābah, Allah mentioned:

اَشِدَّآءُ عَلَى الْكُفَّارِ رُحَمَآءُ بَيْنَهُمْ

> Stern against the kuffār and compassionate among themselves.

We understand from this that after risālat, the highest status is that of "loving for Allah's pleasure" and "hating for Allah's pleasure", since hating or having enmity towards someone for the sake of Allah is the translation of "Stern against the kuffār" and loving for the sake of Allah is the translation of "Compassionate amongst themselves".

This conforms to the ḥadīth which is found in the books of the Ahl al-Sunnah, the crux of which is:

> The one who gives for the sake of Allah, who holds back for the sake of Allah, who loves for the sake of Allah, and who hates for the sake of Allah, has perfected his īmān.

It is an absolute fact that the aḥādīth of the Ahl al-Sunnah always conform in totality to the Noble Qur'ān, whereas the so-called aḥādīth of the Shīʿah are such that it always contradicts the Qur'ān. The Qur'ān says something and their so-called aḥādīth say the opposite, a few examples of such aḥādīth of theirs has already been given, regarding which the readers are already well aware.

The wisdom of first mentioning the quality of "Hatred for Allah" before the other qualities

Here is a sublime point which needs to be understood, in the ḥadīth we find that "loving for the sake of Allah" is mentioned first and thereafter "hatred for the sake of Allah" but in the Qur'ān we find the words referring to "hatred for the sake of Allah" (i.e. stern against the kuffār) mentioned first. What is the underlying wisdom behind this?

What comes to the mind of this person of low understanding, is that "loving for the sake of Allah" and "hating for the sake of Allah" are effects of the love one has for Allah.

In other words, when one's love for Allah has reached perfection then that love now spreads forth and wherever it finds anything which is attached or linked to Allah, then according to the degree of attachment it has with Allah, this person also begins to love it.

Loving those attached or linked to the beloved is also loving the beloved

For example, from all humans, the greatest link and attachment to Allah is that of Rasūlullāh ﷺ, so when the person who has complete love for Allah hears about this link of Rasūlullāh ﷺ with Allah, then most definitely he will also begin to love him. Similarly, he will love those people who have an attachment and link with Allah, after Rasūlullāh ﷺ, according to the degree of attachment they have with Allah.

Similarly, the places that have a link and attachment to Allah will be loved by him as well. For example, the Kaʿbah has the greatest link, so he will love the Kaʿbah the most, thereafter the al-Masjid al-Nabawī, and thereafter al-Bayt al-Muqaddas. The same will apply to deeds and actions, character and etiquette.

In short, according to the degree of attachment that exists between a certain person or thing and Allah, accordingly, the lovers of Allah will be attached to those persons or things.

Loving those attached or linked to the beloved is actually part of the love one has for the beloved

For example, when it comes to superficial love, we see that when a person loves someone, he also loves the beloved's relatives and well wishers. In fact, he also begins to love those residing in the same street or alley as the beloved. Just as the

amount of sunlight entering a room from the window will be according to the size of the window, similarly the amount of love one has for the entities attached or linked to the beloved will be according to degree of attachment between those entities and the beloved. However, this love is not a separate love, rather it is part of the love one has for the beloved; just like the sunlight entering into the room is part of the sunlight which is out of the room and not a separate or different light.

Having hatred for those who intend evil for the beloved is not a part of loving the beloved but it is the necessary outcome of this love.

On the contrary, the enmity one harbours towards those who intend evil towards the beloved is the necessary outcome of this love, but it is not a part of that love. In other words, the love one has for the beloved demands that one also hates those who intend evil for the beloved, but this hatred is not an integral part of loving the beloved. In fact, it is not even of the same category. Just like a shadow, when there is some wall or other object blocking the sunlight then we find a shadow being created on the other side. This shadow is not part of the sunlight, in fact it is not even of the same genus as the sunlight, but it is definitely a necessary outcome of the sunlight, on condition that there is a barrier.

Based on the above discussion, we can understand that those who love Allah will most definitely hate those who are the enemies of Allah, but this hatred is not part of their love for Allah, rather it is the necessary outcome of this love for Allah.

The love one has for the *auliyā’* (friends of Allah) is actually part of the love one has for Allah, it is not some separate entity. Therefore when Rasūlullāh ﷺ praised these qualities of “loving for the sake of Allah” and “hating for the sake of Allah”, he mentioned loving for the sake of Allah first and hating for the sake of Allah second, because this is the required sequence.

In the Noble Qur’ān on the other hand, Allah is not praising these two qualities, instead He is praising those who have these two qualities.

When praising someone, the natural order is to begin with the lesser quality, then the greater one and finally the greatest quality

The general practice when praising a person who has different qualities is to begin with the quality which is of a lesser degree, then to mention the one of more importance or significance and thereafter the one which is most important or significant, so that each quality can be valued accordingly. If the most important or most significant quality is mentioned first, one will not value the lesser qualities mentioned thereafter, which are also part of the praiseworthy qualities being mentioned.

Also worth remembering is that a quality in itself is either good or bad, and the person himself is not good or bad; being good or bad depends on the quality found in him.

If good or evil qualities are being discussed then the most important or most significant quality will be mentioned first but when the good or evil qualities of a person are being discussed then it will be mentioned in sequence and the order will be reversed (i.e. the lesser quality will be mentioned first).

When the question is about the difference in status between two sets of qualities found in two entities, for example which one has more qualities or which one has less, or which one has better qualities and which one has lesser qualities, then this is in fact discussing and praising the qualities itself, therefore the order used will be the same order used when discussing just the qualities (whereby the most significant will be mentioned first). This is why Rasūlullāh ﷺ was mentioned first and thereafter the Ṣaḥābah (in the verse under discussion).

In short, the first quality mentioned in the verse regarding the Ṣaḥābah is the lesser of their noble qualities enumerated in this verse, namely:

اَشِدَّآءُ عَلَى الْكُفَّارِ

> Stern against the kuffār.

To love is easy, but to hate is difficult, especially when it is one's own relatives

Since loving is easy because one is naturally inclined towards the one who loves him, loving for the sake of Allah cannot be truly gauged. On the contrary, displaying hatred or enmity is difficult, especially since the one whom you have enmity for will in turn have enmity for you and oppose you.

Therefore hating for the sake of Allah is regarded as a sign of complete īmān, especially when this hatred is for ones relatives, as this is even more difficult.

So if in general hatred for the sake of Allah is a sign of complete and perfect īmān, then hatred for the sake of Allah when directed to one's own relatives, will be regarded as a sign of extra-complete and absolutely perfect īmān.

When we look at the verses prior to this we come to know that this hatred for the sake of Allah refers to hatred for ones relatives, since the verse before this reads:

لَقَدْ صَدَقَ اللّٰهُ رَسُوْلَهُ الرُّءْيَا بِالْحَقِّ ۚ لَتَدْخُلُنَّ الْمَسْجِدَ الْحَرَامَ اِنْ شَآءَ اللّٰهُ اٰمِنِيْنَ

> Verily, Allah shall make the dream of His Rasūl ﷺ come precisely true, when Allah wills, you (Ṣaḥābah with Rasūlullāh ﷺ) shall definitely enter the al-Masjid al-Ḥarām in peace.[1]

This was revealed to console and comfort the Ṣaḥābah and to remove their grief, and the grief at that point was the grief caused on the occasion of Ḥudaybiyyah.

Rasūlullāh ﷺ returned after signing a treaty with the kuffār and their hopes of entering the Ḥaram were crushed, leaving their most ardent desire, especially of the muhājirīn, unfulfilled. Rasūlullāh ﷺ had seen a dream that they were performing Ṭawāf around the Kaʿbah in peace and safety, and they thought it would materialise that very year. As a result, the hearts of the Ṣaḥābah were filled

1 Sūrah al-Fatḥ: 27

with such joy and happiness as cannot be explained. However, all this happiness and joy was turned into grief and sorrow.

At that moment, the state of the Ṣaḥābah was such that if it were not for their obedience to Rasūlullāh ﷺ, they would have attacked and destroyed all the kuffār of Makkah, without worrying about relations or considering family ties. The muhājirīn, who were related to the kuffār of Makkah, were ready to kill them due to their intense love for Allah and in order to please Rasūlullāh ﷺ.

When the above incident, together with the previous verse and the verse under discussion:

مُحَمَّدٌ رَّسُوْلُ اللّٰهِ ؕ وَالَّذِيْنَ مَعَهٗۤ اَشِدَّآءُ عَلَى الْكُفَّارِ رُحَمَآءُ بَيْنَهُمْ تَرٰىهُمْ رُكَّعًا سُجَّدًا يَّبْتَغُوْنَ فَضْلًا مِّنَ اللّٰهِ وَ رِضْوَانًا ؗ سِيْمَاهُمْ فِيْ وُجُوْهِهِمْ مِّنْ اَثَرِ السُّجُوْدِ ؕ

Muḥammad ﷺ is Allah's Rasūl and those with him (the Ṣaḥābah) are stern against the kuffār and compassionate among themselves. You will see them sometimes bowing, sometimes prostrating; seeking Allah's bounty and His pleasure. Their hallmark (by which they are recognised) their faces bear the marks of prostration.

are read together, then the scenario is created of the Ṣaḥābah having intense anger at every disbeliever, who is an enemy of Allah and Rasūlullāh ﷺ, but this verse especially points to their anger against the kuffār of Makkah on the occasion of Ḥudaybiyyah.

Since the muhājirīn were the relatives of these kuffār of Makkah, the words:

اَشِدَّآءُ عَلَى الْكُفَّارِ

Stern against the kuffār.

is a sign of their extra-complete absolutely perfect īmān.

Furthermore, when we have understood that the first quality mentioned here is the lowest of their sublime qualities and that the lowest of their qualities in fact points to their extra-complete and absolutely perfect īmān; what can be said about the remaining qualities mentioned thereafter?

Since we are all aware that the mu'minīn with complete īmān are few in number, it is not an easy task for every person to achieve this state of absolute perfection.

The Ṣaḥābah are stern against shayṭān and their inner selves

Moreover making mention of Rasūlullāh ﷺ first and the Ṣaḥābah second points out that Rasūlullāh ﷺ holds the first position in the ummah and the Ṣaḥābah the second. So we can conclude that the Ṣaḥābah are the loftiest of the "sincere slaves" to such an extent that shayṭān can never ever reach them. In fact, since shayṭān is the chief of the kuffār and the Ṣaḥābah are:

اَشِدَّآءُ عَلَى الْكُفَّارِ

Stern against the kuffār.

so they will be even more stern, firm and severe against shayṭān. Similarly, the *nafs* (inner-self) is also the enemy of dīn, in fact it is the greatest enemy such that even shayṭān takes the assistance from the nafs of man because if the nafs does not give in to shayṭān, he cannot do anything.

In short, the Ṣaḥābah's enmity and sternness will be even more towards shayṭān and the nafs, since hating the enemies of Allah is proportionate to the enmity

these enemies have for Allah; the more their enmity, the more the Ṣaḥābah hate them.

As for other "sincere slaves", shayṭān has no sway over them, but for the Ṣaḥābah there was not even the fear of it happening, since the Ṣaḥābah rendered him

helpless. No wonder he would flee from them. Perhaps, this is the reason that shayṭān used to flee from the shadow of ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, because he was a 'fatal poison' for the kuffār and the quality:

اَشِدَّآءُ عَلَى الْكُفَّارِ

Stern against the kuffār.

was prevalent in him more than anyone else. Can shayṭān ever mislead the one from whom he flees?

In this manner, the necessary outcome is that no difference will come in their *ibādah* (worship), and there will not be any show, insincerity, etc, since these spiritual sicknesses are the result of these two evil forces (shayṭān and the nafs) and when these two have come under control, what is left to mislead man?

If someone errs due to some misunderstanding, not due to the effects of shayṭān and the nafs, then too there is hope of him receiving reward

If any wrong action were to be committed, then it will only be due to misunderstanding. Therefore one should be rewarded on that also. For example: Nabī Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام grabbed the hair of Nabī Harūn عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام in anger, whereas there was no error on the part of Nabī Harūn عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام. This is definitely not regarded as a crime, and there will be no punishment for such an action, instead there is hope of reward, since the cause for such an action was love of Allah and hating for the sake of Allah, and these two qualities are praiseworthy qualities. In fact, they rank as one of the highest amongst the praiseworthy qualities. On the other hand, we know that the true basis of an action is not determined on its outer form, as then everybody will be rewarded equally for their ṣalāh. We are therefore totally convinced that Nabī Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام will be rewarded on his action.

Yes, this is also true that after being informed of the error there was regret. This regret was because of the error, and it does not mean that because there was regret, the action is evil to the extent that it demands punishment.

The reason being that the action in itself might have been wrong, but due to the overpowering good intention it becomes good, just like a slap is regarded as something bad, but the slap of a friend causes a type of freshness and awakening to a grieved heart, due to it being done out of love.

The disputes amongst the Ṣaḥābah were not due to the effects of shayṭān and the nafs but due to this same hatred for the sake of Allah

In short, when it has come to light that shayṭān and the nafs of the Ṣaḥābah were subdued, then if any inappropriate action did take place on their part, in all likelihood it stemmed from misunderstanding. In this instance the action in itself might have been bad but it was not driven by ill-will. Shayṭān and the nafs, which normally has its part in inciting evil, did not have any part in this action coming about. Instead the power of their īmān was the major factor which caused this to take place. So now because of the overpowering good intention and strength of īmān, the evil of the action was overwhelmed, like a few grams of sugar or salt in a well or a river.

So just as Nabī Mūsā عَلَيۡهِ ٱلسَّلَامُ grabbing the hair of his brother was a result of hatred for the sake of Allah, similarly the disputes amongst the Ṣaḥābah were also based upon this same "Hatred for the sake of Allah". However, just as Nabī Mūsā عَلَيۡهِ ٱلسَّلَامُ erred by using this "Hatred for the sake of Allah" in an inappropriate place, similarly the Ṣaḥābah erred by exercising this extreme "Hatred for the sake of Allah" and committed an error, as they did not understand the reality of the matter. In such an instance they will not be taken to task, instead they will be rewarded.

Yes, if such an act transpires which is not spurred on by hatred for the sake of Allah or by any other good quality, and instead it is such a thing upon which there can be no reward and it can only be regarded as permissible, then there will not be any reward. However, at the same time they will not be taken to task, on account of it having taken place due to a misunderstanding.

The nafs can be subdued, but its nature cannot change

There also exists this possibility that now and then, very rarely, due to the human instinct, an inappropriate act transpires. The reason for this is that although shayṭān does not have any sway over the "sincere slaves" of Allah and the nafs may also have been subdued and it now obeys him, it is still just like an elephant which hates the human being but has been subdued and overpowered. It may obey the human being but the elephant after all is still an elephant, it did not transform into a human being by the human subduing it, so sometimes it still displays its true nature.

Similarly, the nafs although subdued and overpowered due to firm īmān and intense love for Allah, after all it is still the nafs and naturally incites one towards evil and vice.

The basis of good is the rūḥ and the basis of evil is the nafs

Let us explain this in detail, when we find in the body the four different conditions: i.e. heat, cold, wetness and dryness, we learn that the body is made up of the root or basis of those four conditions, i.e. fire, air, water and sand. Similarly, when we see that the human is sometimes inclined towards good and sometimes inclined towards evil, we understand that the human is made up of the root or basis of these two conditions.

However, as in the case of the four elements, each element has its own special condition, the condition of another element is not found in this element, and if it has to be found then it would only be temporary, like water which gets hot. Similarly with regards to the basis or root of good and evil, each one has its own condition, and if one is found in the other then it is only temporary.

Once we have accepted this, now let us explain further:

The root of good is the *rūḥ* (soul) and the root of evil is the nafs. The rūḥ in itself is the root of good and if it is overpowered such that evil emits from it, then it will

be said to be a temporary state. The nafs on the other hand is in itself the root of evil and if it gets overpowered such that good emits from it, then it will also be regarded to be a temporary state.

The rūḥ is an entity from the realm of malā'ikah and the nafs is from the circle of the shayāṭīn

Going further, from the heat in the body we come to know of a 'piece of fire' found in the body, and we say that the root of this fire is the 'region of fire'. Allah, through His unlimited power, has brought the 'piece of fire' from its origin and placed it within the body of the human being. Similarly, when we see the inclination to do good, firstly we understand that there is something within the human which is the basis or root of this good, thereafter we understand that it has its roots in the circles of the *malā'ikah* (angels), regarding whom Allah has declared:

لَّا يَعْصُوْنَ اللّٰهَ مَآ اَمَرَهُمْ وَ يَفْعَلُوْنَ مَا يُؤْمَرُوْنَ ﴿٦﴾

> They never disobey what Allah commands them and carry out exactly what they are instructed.[1]

The gist of this is that their speciality is doing good.

Furthermore, when we see a person inclined to evil, we firstly understand that there is within him a 'piece' of something which is specifically for evil, thereafter we figure out that the root of this 'piece' is from the circle of shayāṭīn, regarding whom Allah says:

وَكَانَ الشَّيْطٰنُ لِرَبِّهٖ كَفُوْرًا ﴿٢٧﴾

> And shayṭān was ever ungrateful to his Rabb.[2]

1 Sūrah al-Taḥrīm: 6

2 Sūrah Banī Isrā'īl: 27

The gist of this is that shayṭān was always disobedient to Allah, which means that shayṭān's specific quality is evil and disobedience.

In short, the rūḥ is something from the realm of malā'ikah and the nafs is from the circle of shayāṭīn, and Allah has through His unlimited power gathered the two in one place, just like how a parrot and a crow are placed in one cage.

The various stages of good or evil through which the human passes are due to the effect of the angels or shayṭān

Just as in the human body the four elements gain strength from its origin, similarly the rūḥ and nafs also gain strength from its origin, i.e. the malā'ikah and the shayāṭīn. This is also borne out by certain aḥādīth. Logic also dictates that on different occasions, when either good or bad is dominant, it is either the effect of the malā'ikah or of the shayāṭīn, because if this were not the case then only the natural inclination of man would have remained.

In short, if the natural condition goes away, then it goes away due to some outer force, so the inclination to do good can only be attributed to the assistance of the malā'ikah and inclination to evil can only be from the effect of the shayāṭīn.

When the nafs is brought under control then the level of "Stern upon the kuffār" is attained

In light of this, if at any time the desire to do good becomes dominant and as a result one becomes absorbed in carrying out good deeds, resulting in the effects of the rūḥ rubbing off on to the nafs, just as when a fire is lit beneath a pot of water whereby the heat of the fire warms the water and removes its inherent quality of coolness. Here too the rūḥ assists the inner-self in the same manner and just as the water (after heating) is able to carry out the same task as the fire, so too here will the nafs be able to act in the same manner as the rūḥ. Thus, when the rūḥ is dominant then the nafs is controlled and one attains the level of "Stern against the kuffār", wherein shayṭān no longer has any grip upon a person. In this event the same control which he once had no longer remains.

When the nafs is controlled then too do not trust

However, just as we have no choice and control over another, such as in the case with a slave or servant whereby we can only instruct them to carry out a task but not will them to do it, and it is by their choice that they carry it out; so too shayṭān desists from whispering to the nafs. Nevertheless, when the nafs is brought under control or suppressed it becomes submissive to the rūḥ. However, the nafs is after all the nafs, and just as water is still water regardless of how hot it may be, such that the hot water is still able to extinguish the fire in the same way as cold water, and the heat of the water too is temporary such that if the fire is extinguished or the pot removed from the fire then the water will immediately begin to cool; in the same manner, if the nafs is neglected for even a moment, it will return to its normal state.

A person can never remain in one state

It is impossible to remain in one state, especially such a creation regarding whom Allah Taʿālā has said:

وَ لَقَدْ عَهِدْنَآ اِلٰٓى اٰدَمَ مِنْ قَبْلُ فَنَسِیَ وَ لَمْ نَجِدْ لَهٗ عَزْمًا ﴿۱۱۵﴾

> We certainly commanded Ādam عَلَيْهِ ٱلسَّلَامُ before, but he forgot and We did not find him to be determined (to remember what We had told him).[1]

Since these qualities were found in Nabī Ādam عَلَيْهِ ٱلسَّلَامُ, it will be found in varying quantities in all human beings. The reason for this is that in procreation certain qualities of the essence still remain. In human beings there is essence of human being; in horses there is the essence of horses and in donkeys there is the essence of donkeys and so on. When the essential quality remains then all those that will be the siblings created from it will have the same qualities like that of the source. Therefore all qualities of Nabī Ādam عَلَيْهِ ٱلسَّلَامُ will be found in varying quantities in all human beings. As the saying goes:

> A child reflects the qualities of his father.

1 Sūrah Ṭāhā: 115

So if all human beings cannot remain in one state then at times one might slip in guarding the nafs and it may begin to incline towards its natural state, resulting in some error or the other being committed.

As far as the thought of changing the reality of the nafs to act permanently as the rūḥ, this is impossible. Allah Taʿālā says:

لَا تَبْدِيْلَ لِخَلْقِ اللّٰهِ

> There can be no change to Allah's creation.[1]

There is a vast difference between those sins committed when overpowered by the nafs and those committed when the nafs has been overpowered

In essence, one can never be free from forgetfulness or error but the sin committed in this case is not equal to the sin committed when the nafs is dominant and the rūḥ has no effect on it, and instead the nafs affects the rūḥ. The reason for this difference is that one was not deficient in any way as he is only required to make his rūḥ dominant and suppress his nafs. It is not his duty or in his capacity to transform the nafs into the rūḥ (such that it only commands him to do good), since this is beyond his capacity. When a person has done all in his capability, is he not worthy of forgiveness? Allah Taʿālā himself says:

لَا يُكَلِّفُ اللّٰهُ نَفْسًا اِلَّا وُسْعَهَا

> Allah does not compel any one beyond his ability.

Therefore we have firm belief and conviction that in this case when one perpetrates sin in error, even though it is still a sin, Allah through His all-encompassing mercy and the afore-mentioned promise will forgive him.

It is possible that the errors in judgement committed by the ambiyā' are of this category, for which they were reprimanded, or it may fall under the category-

1 Sūrah al-Rūm: 30

Ḥasanāt al-Abrār Sayyi'āt al-Mukarrabīn, in other words what may be conspired to be commendable for the layman is deemed inappropriate for the close servants of Allah.

Those who are stern against the kuffār may err but shayṭān cannot gain control over them

At this juncture, I wish to highlight that Allah Taʿālā praised the Ṣaḥābah with this description, that they are:

اَشِدَّآءُ عَلَى الْكُفَّارِ رُحَمَآءُ بَيْنَهُمْ

> Stern against the kuffār and compassionate among themselves.

and then too with such qualities that it ranks immediately after risālat. These qualities by no means indicate that they cannot commit any sin or error. It will only be impossible if those described to possess this quality were capable of changing the reality of the nafs. It is also evident that those who possess this quality cannot remain in one state, and how is it possible for them to remain in one state when they possess in themselves two opposing states which are literally enemies of each other? It suffices for them that shayṭān cannot gain control over them and Allah Taʿālā will remove evil and vice from their path. Allah Taʿālā mentioned this to be the reason for removing evil and vice from Nabī Yūsuf عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ, namely that he was a chosen servant of Allah.

كَذٰلِكَ لِنَصْرِفَ عَنْهُ السُّوْٓءَ وَالْفَحْشَآءَ ۚ اِنَّهٗ مِنْ عِبَادِنَا الْمُخْلَصِيْنَ ﴿۲۴﴾

> In this manner, so as to avert evil and immorality from him. Indeed he was from Our sincere bondsmen.[1]

Thus, it is not necessary that those who are described as severe and stern against the kuffār and compassionate amongst themselves, should not and cannot have any faults.

1 Sūrah Yūsuf: 24

The quality of being stern against the kuffār and compassionate amongst each other, necessitates sincerity and negates the possibility of boastfulness

At the same time it is necessary that they not be lethargic in performing ibādah and boastfulness should have no place in their actions. If he seeks anything from his ibādah then he seeks the pleasure of Allah, if his gaze is upon anything it is the virtues of Allah. This is why Allah Taʿālā followed mention of these two qualities (stern against the kuffār and compassionate amongst each other) with another two qualities:

تَرٰیهُمْ رُکَّعًا سُجَّدًا یَّبْتَغُوْنَ فَضْلًا مِّنَ اللّٰهِ وَ رِضْوَانًا ۫ سِیْمَاهُمْ فِیْ وُجُوْهِهِمْ مِّنْ اَثَرِ السُّجُوْدِ

> You will see them sometimes bowing, sometimes prostrating; seeking Allah's bounty and His pleasure. Their hallmark (by which they are recognised is) their faces bear the marks of prostration.

Even the most honourable at times can regard good to be evil due to misinterpretation

After having understood the above explanation, I wish to enlighten the Shīʿah scholars that many a time even the most honourable and high ranking can misinterpret a good action to be evil. Nabī Mūsā عَلَيۡهِ السَّلَامُ who was the nabī of his time misinterpreted the action of Khidar عَلَيۡهِ السَّلَامُ damaging the boat to be wrong.

He understood this to be opposing the Sharīʿah, so much so that he condemned him by saying:

لَقَدْ جِئْتَ شَیْئًا اِمْرًا

> Indeed, you have perpetrated a grave act.[1]

This was despite the fact that Khidar عَلَيۡهِ السَّلَامُ did nothing wrong, in fact he did something commendable. If he had not broken the boat then it would have been seized by the king.

---

1 Sūrah al-Kahaf: 71

In the same manner, if some Shīʿah scholars have misinterpreted the actions of a few of the Ṣaḥābah, for example the issue of not giving the land of Fadak, or any other action for that matter, and regard it to be wrong, even though in reality it was not, then it would not be something unperceivable.

If one were to say that Khidar صَلَّى ٱللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ was under divine inspiration and therefore it would make sense for others not to understand him, whereas Abū Bakr رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ was not under any divine inspiration, then we say that this line of thinking is also incorrect. We would like to remind you of the anger of Nabī Mūsā عَلَيْهِ ٱلسَّلَامُ at his brother, Nabī Hārūn عَلَيْهِ ٱلسَّلَامُ, and the manner in which he grabbed hold of his head and beard, which he did because he was not aware of the actual events that had transpired. So if Fāṭimah رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهَا too had not been aware of the actual events, what harm is there? In this even there is no question of divine inspiration and Nabī Hārūn عَلَيْهِ ٱلسَّلَامُ committed no error. If the Shīʿah insist that such an error from her is impossible on account of her being infallible then it should be noted that Fāṭimah رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهَا is only considered to be infallible by the Shīʿah, whereas Nabī Mūsā عَلَيْهِ ٱلسَّلَامُ is regarded as such by both the Ahl al-Sunnah and the Shīʿah.

If you do not accept this as well then this unworthy one has clarified in the preceding pages that the pious and sincere servants of Allah at times can err and these errors in no way negates their piety. Piety is one matter and committing a sin is something else altogether.

The sin which would negate the *wilāyah* (sainthood) of a person would be such a sin committed while the nafs remains dominant and the rūḥ subservient to it, and not an act committed by human error. This is why we cannot say regarding what has been mentioned regarding Nabī Ādam عَلَيْهِ ٱلسَّلَامُ:

وَ عَصٰى اٰدَمُ رَبَّهٗ فَغَوٰى

> Ādam عَلَيْهِ ٱلسَّلَامُ (mistakenly) broke the command of his Rabb and deviated (from the way shown to him).[1]

1 Sūrah Ṭāhā: 122

Or in relation to Nabī Yūnus عَلَيْهِ ٱلسَّلَامُ, Allah said:

فَاصْبِرْ لِحُكْمِ رَبِّكَ وَ لَا تَكُنْ كَصَاحِبِ الْحُوْتِ

> (O Rasūlullāh صَلَّىٰ ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ!) Be patient with the decision of your Rabb (to delay punishment) and do not be (hasty) like the person of the fish (Nabī Yūnus عَلَيْهِ ٱلسَّلَامُ).[1]

And even in relation to Rasūlullāh صَلَّىٰ ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ:

مَا كَانَ لِنَبِيٍّ اَنْ يَّكُوْنَ لَهٗٓ اَسْرٰى حَتّٰى يُثْخِنَ فِى الْاَرْضِ

> It is not befitting for a Nabī that he takes prisoners until he has thoroughly beaten (the enemy) in the land.[2]

What will the meaning of all these verses be? More so when they are all mentioned in the Book of Allah, thus there is no possibility of denying them as well. On the other hand, the errors of the Ṣaḥābah, if they are even regarded as errors and not misunderstandings, then too it has not been mentioned in the Qur'ān nor in the mutawātir aḥādīth of Rasūlullāh صَلَّىٰ ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, making it possible that these reports are incorrect and not at all authentic. Yet I will say that they are not incorrect but whatever response you give in the defence of the ambiyā', understand the same for the Ṣaḥābah. In fact, they are more excused as they were not infallible and they were not ambiyā', yet Allah Taʿālā praised them so glowingly, so what reply is still required and what excuse needs to be given?

Such praise despite the possibility of error indicates Allah's forgiveness and pleasure

In essence, such errors are not blameworthy and no sane person will ever accept that they will be taken to task or punished for it. We have already hinted that the

1 Sūrah al-Qalam: 48

2 Sūrah al-Anfāl: 67

mention of these qualities:

اَشِدَّآءُ عَلَى الْكُفَّارِ رُحَمَآءُ بَيْنَهُمْ

Stern against the kuffār and compassionate among themselves.

does not necessitate that they never commit any error. Thus, when this is not a necessity and yet Allah Taʿālā has praised them, it indicates that these qualities are such that on account of it, they will not be taken to task for the errors they commit but rather they will be eclipsed by the beauty of this trait. In other words, this verse subtly hints towards their forgiveness, as praising a pig or even filth would be better than praising any dweller of Jahannam.

However a discerning mind is required, how is it possible for the Ṣaḥābah to be destined for Jahannam when they have been praised in such a manner? In this instance, one can ascribe a thousand sins to them, it will not harm them but instead it will destroy the future of the one who ascribes it to them.

Such praise despite the possibility of error is a slap in the face of their enemies

When a wise king who is concerned about the rule of his country and aware of the affairs of his subjects does not admonish a few of his governors for the errors they commit then it is a sign that he loves them dearly. On the other hand, if the king were to rather praise them (even though they may have erred) and show enmity to their enemies and enumerate their virtues to such an extent that the king announces that whoever possesses the same qualities as they do will be forgiven by me and in fact rewarded, then their will remain no other conclusion except that the king loves them dearly and he loves those who love them and he is the enemy of those who hate them.

One objective of praising the Ṣaḥābah is to offend their future enemies

By the grace of Allah, all of this can be understood by studying these verses. It

begins with such praise for the Ṣaḥābah that there can be no higher praise for any other in this ummah and thereafter Allah Taʿālā says:

لِيَغِيْظَ بِهِمُ الْكُفَّارَ ؕ

So that the kuffār may be enraged by them.

In other words, whatever has been said above in praise of the Ṣaḥābah has been said to offend and anger the kuffār, i.e. their enemies.

Subḥān Allāh, Allah's knowledge is so vast that he has indicated to what is still to transpire. Allah Taʿālā knew already that the Shīʿah, Nawāṣib and Khawārij would show insolence towards the Ṣaḥābah and have no regard for their standing in the sight of Allah.

As far as the necessity for the words "أعداءهم" (their enemies) needing to be mentioned after the words "ليغيظ بهم" (to enrage, making the meaning: "So that their enemies may be enraged by them"); the reason why the word "kuffār" was mentioned is to indicate that only the kuffār can do such a thing. A mu'min can never have enmity for such people, who have been praised by Allah Taʿālā and for whom Allah Taʿālā has announced his pleasure.

The Shīʿah are indebted to the Ṣaḥābah as well

In other words, those enemies of the Ṣaḥābah who have had the good fortune of reciting the *kalimah* (testimony of faith) and consider themselves to be Muslims, they too are indebted to the sacrifices of the Ṣaḥābah. If the Ṣaḥābah had not made jihād then Islam would not have spread and the Qur'ān would not have been recited as it is, such that even the Shīʿah (despite the condition of their recitation) are also able to benefit somewhat from it. With this in mind, if one is not grateful to the Ṣaḥābah then who will gratitude be shown to and if disrespect is still shown towards them then who will they show respect to? Who can be a greater denier of the bounty of Allah than them? This is why Allah Taʿālā has referred to the enemies of the Ṣaḥābah as kuffār.

Enumerating the virtues of the Ṣaḥābah in the Qur'ān foretells the coming of those who will bear enmity for them

Since Allah knew through his infinite knowledge that there will be people who will speak ill of the Ṣaḥābah as has been explained above, Allah Taʿālā also said:

وَعَدَ اللّٰهُ الَّذِيْنَ اٰمَنُوْا وَ عَمِلُوا الصّٰلِحٰتِ مِنْهُمْ مَّغْفِرَةً وَّ اَجْرًا عَظِيْمًا ﴿٢٩﴾

> Allah has promised forgiveness and a grand reward for those of them who have īmān and who do good deeds.[1]

In other words:

> O you who deny the Ṣaḥābah! This group of Ṣaḥābah whom we have praised and regarding whom you do not desist speaking ill of, even if by chance they happen to be as you describe and did truly commit these errors then too what of it? I have promised that whoever amongst them has īmān and does good deeds, I will forgive his sins and grant him a most gracious reward. When they are stern against the kuffār and compassionate amongst each other, always engaged in ṣalāh, seeking nothing else but the pleasure of Allah, then why should I not forgive their sins and why should I not reward them for their īmān and righteous deeds? What greater form of īmān and righteous deeds are there than this?

Promise of forgiveness and reward was unconditional

If it had been stated that in order to attain forgiveness and this gracious reward there is one condition and that is you should not commit any sin whatsoever, then perhaps the Shīʿah might have had a leg to stand on, but there is no such condition mentioned here. Those with understanding know full-well that the word "منهم" (from amongst them) that comes after the word "عملوا الصالحات" (who do good deeds) was only mentioned as a response to those who deny (the

1 Sūrah al-Fatḥ: 29

virtues of the Ṣaḥābah). If one were to assume that some of them did indeed have īmān and performed righteous deeds while others amongst them still remained firm on disbelief, Allah forbid, then we know that the Shīʿah will not raise any objections after this verse, because they too know full well that it is impossible to call a person a disbeliever after Allah Taʿālā has called him a believer. Thus, Allah Taʿālā has first testified to their īmān and performance of righteous deeds and in fact here Allah testified to them having the highest level of īmān and them performing the best of actions, as there can be no greater īmān that would warrant Allah Taʿālā declaring enmity with all those who bear enmity towards them and announcing friendship with all those who hold them dear.

The meaning of īmān and the levels of conviction

The reason for the conclusion made above is extremely clear. Since īmān means to believe in something after attaining conviction, the technical definition of īmān in Sharīʿah is to have complete conviction in the perfection of Allah and then submit to Him. For example, Allah is Aḥkam al-Ḥākimīn (The Wisest of those who decree), so īmān will first necessitate that one believe that Allah possesses this quality in absolute perfection and then submit to Him. Furthermore, submitting means that you do not go against the laws in anyway. The same applies to all the attributes of Allah.

The different levels of conviction

However there are different levels of conviction:

ʿIlm al-Yaqīn: This is the lowest level of conviction. An example of this is when a reliable person tells us about the existence of something in a specific place. This level of conviction is attained by every Muslim because Rasūlullāh ﷺ, who is without a doubt truthful, has informed us of the perfect attributes of Allah. If a person does not have at least this level of conviction then he does not have īmān.

ʿAyn al-Yaqīn: This is the second level of conviction. This is the conviction attained when one sees with his naked eye what he had heard previously. This

kind of conviction is higher than the first because hearing about something is not the same as seeing it for yourself. This is the reason why people do not fall in love with a person on mere mention of their beauty whereas the love which fills the heart after gazing at that beauty is obvious and needs no explanation. All know the stories of Laylā, Shirīn and even Nabī Yūsuf عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ but the tales of their beauty, despite being incredibly astonishing, does not cause one to swoon in a frenzy of love. Such that even after hearing of the beauty of Nabī Yūsuf عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ, no one fell in love with him, but the moment the women saw him, they were mesmerised by his beauty. The reason for this is that merely hearing about something does not create love, as then Nabī Yūsuf عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ was after all Nabī Yūsuf عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ.

Whatever is heard will only be understood in terms of what one has seen. For example, whenever a person sees something beautiful then he experiences a feeling of elation in his heart; now when he hears from another that a certain person is beautiful, he compares it to his previous experience and this creates desire to see the described person. If one does not have something to compare it to then mere words would do nothing for him. This is why a person born blind, who has never seen beauty and cannot differentiate between beautiful and grotesque, will never love a person for their looks (and descriptions of their beauty will have no meaning to him).

Ḥaqq al-Yaqīn: This is the final level of conviction and is attained when a person makes use of what he has seen with his eye. For example, a person sees water and thereafter drinks it; after drinking it he is convinced that it is water and all doubts that it could possibly be urine or anything else besides water are all removed.

This level of conviction is higher than ʿAyn al-Yaqīn and the love that was created by merely looking is increased tenfold.

Love is only created after Ḥaqq al-Yaqīn

In reality, love is only created in this level (Ḥaqq al-Yaqīn) because the love one has for water is only because it quenches the thirst, which was only learnt

from drinking it. If for example there were to be a person who never heard of water before, nor saw it or ever drank it, and never experienced a need for it but suddenly he becomes thirsty and water is placed before him; how will he know the effects of that water and that it will quench his thirst? If Allah does not inspire his heart to drink the water or someone does not inform him of its effects then his mind will never consider drinking it.

Looking at the beauty of a person creates love because of the similitude to gazing at a beautiful flower, which brings peace to the soul, so too does gazing at the beauty of another do the same. In essence, logic dictates that love is attained with Ḥaqq al-Yaqīn, which is evident. If I had not feared this discussion becoming excessively lengthy, I would have elaborated further on this point but with my full schedule and little time, I cannot do so and then too the reply to the letter is required quickly, therefore I will suffice with whatever has been said.

The Ṣaḥābah attained the level of Ḥaqq al-Yaqīn and hating for the pleasure of Allah and loving for the pleasure of Allah was rooted in their hearts

In essence, love is attained with Ḥaqq al-Yaqīn and this is the highest level of conviction. Thereafter the highest level of love is to love all those associated with the beloved and furthermore hate the enemies of the beloved. Thus, Allah Taʿālā testified that the Ṣaḥābah have hatred for the enemies of Allah and love for the friends of Allah, which establishes that they have the highest level of love for Allah.

One might say that it is not necessary that loving a Muslim is only for the sake of Allah as there are many reasons for love. One might love another on account of family relation or perhaps because of kindness or even friendship, as well as many other countless reasons. Similarly, there are many reasons for hating another. So as long as it cannot be proven that this love or hate was for the sake of Allah, your claim cannot be established.

The first answer to this is that whenever love, or hatred for that matter, is attached to a particular quality then the love or hatred is always understood to be on account of that quality. For example, if someone says: "I love good people" or "I love educated people" or even if he were to say "I hate arrogant people" or "I hate the kuffār", then even the unjust would not misunderstand the reason for this love or hatred. It would be impossible for any person to still doubt the reason for his hatred and love. Allah Taʿālā also said:

اَشِدَّآءُ عَلَى الْكُفَّارِ رُحَمَآءُ بَيْنَهُمْ

They are stern against the kuffār and compassionate among themselves.

In this verse, Allah said that the Ṣaḥābah are stern against the kuffār and the meaning of kāfir is that he is an open enemy to Allah. This makes it clear that their hatred for them is on account of their kufr and no other reason. Therefore if their hatred is on account of kufr then their love is also for the sake of Allah. This is the purpose of:

رُحَمَآءُ بَيْنَهُمْ

Compassionate among themselves.

In other words, the compassion they have for each other is on account of them being in the company of Rasūlullāh ﷺ and in his service; the gist of which is that they are all the beloveds of Allah and thus their compassion for each other will also be for the sake of Allah.

The purpose of the Ṣaḥābah was only to gain the pleasure of Allah

In addition to the above, the statement:

يَّبْتَغُوْنَ فَضْلًا مِّنَ اللّٰهِ وَ رِضْوَانًا

Seeking Allah's bounty and His pleasure.

has beautifully established the reality of their actions that whatever they do they do solely for the sake of Allah. Therefore, hatred for the kuffār and mutual love and compassion for the mu'minīn was all for the sake of Allah, and seeking Allah's pleasure is the greatest sign of love for Allah. There is no other reason for seeking the pleasure of Allah except love for Allah. The majority of people who exert themselves in fulfilling virtuous deeds do so more in search of Jannah than in seeking Allah's pleasure, just as one who is poverty stricken endeavours to please the affluent in search of a slice of bread. His purpose is not to seek the pleasure of the wealthy man but rather only desires a morsel to eat. Thus, truly seeking the pleasure of another is an act which can only be carried out by one filled with love for that person. In that light the hatred the Ṣaḥābah bore for the kuffār and the love they had for each other were all products of the love they had for Allah Taʿālā.

The love and submission of the Ṣaḥābah was of the highest level

Since love is only attained with Ḥaqq al-Yaqīn, which is the highest form of conviction. The conviction which the Ṣaḥābah had in the Majesty, Might, Grandeur, Perfection and Beauty of Allah was of the highest, after which there is no greater conviction. Their submission was of such level that its signs were plainly visible, Allah Taʿālā says:

تَرٰىهُمْ رُكَّعًا سُجَّدًا

> You will see them sometimes bowing, sometimes prostrating

If they had not submitted then why would they do these actions? These words together with:

يَّبْتَغُوْنَ فَضْلًا مِّنَ اللّٰهِ وَ رِضْوَانًا ۫ سِيْمَاهُمْ فِىْ وُجُوْهِهِمْ مِّنْ اَثَرِ السُّجُوْدِ

> Seeking Allah's bounty and His pleasure. Their hallmark (by which they are recognised is) their faces bear the marks of prostration.

All these qualities inform us of their righteous deeds. Thus their īmān is proven to be most perfect and their actions for which they were promised forgiveness and a gracious reward proven to be the best actions.

As for the claim that in the company of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ there were some who were true believers and others who were not, which is why Allah Taʿālā added the words "منهم" (from amongst them, indicating that this promise is not for all of the Ṣaḥābah), this is such a claim which only a Shīʿah can make, because if denying the obvious and accepting the impossible was truly prohibited in their religion then no Shīʿah would turn away from the Ahl al-Sunnah and adhere to Shī'asm. If I had not feared that the discussion will be prolonged, I would have mentioned more proofs to support my claim but if those with intellect were to understand this one point then it is sufficient.

Varying stages of Ḥaqq al-Yaqīn

If someone were to argue that if the Ṣaḥābah had Ḥaqq al-Yaqīn, which is the highest form of conviction, then what level have you left for Rasūlullāh صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ? You might as well call them prophets as well, why even refer to them as Ṣaḥābah?

The reply to this misconception is that if a person hears something from a hundred people and is convinced by them, this conviction is still termed ʿIlm al-Yaqīn. Even if he were to hear it from a thousand people then too it will still be regarded as ʿIlm al-Yaqīn even though in the second instance (when hearing from a thousand people) the conviction will be greater.

Similarly, if someone sees something from a distance, he still gains ʿAyn al-Yaqīn and if he sees it a foot away from him, he will also still have only attained ʿAyn al-Yaqīn but obviously the clarity in the second instance (seeing it up close) will not be equal to the first.

In the same manner, when a person drinks a little water he gains Ḥaqq al-Yaqīn

and if he drinks it a few times he has still attained Ḥaqq al-Yaqīn. However, the conviction in the second instance is greater than the former. Many a time, by doing something once one will not attain complete familiarity of it but after doing it repeatedly, he will attain complete knowledge and familiarity of it.

It is not necessary that all people who have attained Ḥaqq al-Yaqīn should be equal. Levels vary from person to person, many a time two people may look simultaneously at one beautiful thing but one might have love for that thing while the other not. If they both love the same person then their love will not be the same. Therefore, the love the Ṣaḥābah had for Allah did not surpass the love Rasūlullāh ﷺ had for Allah.

Differences of opinion does not contradict having compassion for each other

One point remains to be discussed, it is possible that some Shīʿah might say, in a desperate attempt to deny the piety of the Ṣaḥābah:

> Since the Ṣaḥābah had grievous disputes with each other (which are related in the books of the Shīʿah and Ahl al-Sunnah) how can we say that they were compassionate amongst each other? The fact that they had disputes with each other on its own proves that they had no compassion for each other, so how can we conclude that they had complete and perfect īmān? What we can conclude is that those who hurt and fought against Amīr al-Mu'minīn ʿAlī رضي الله عنه are not included amongst those described by:
>
> رُحَمَآءُ بَيْنَهُمْ
>
> Compassionate among themselves.
>
> and furthermore they are not those described by the words:
>
> الَّذِيْنَ اٰمَنُوْا وَ عَمِلُوا الصّٰلِحٰتِ
>
> Those who have īmān and who do good deeds.

> In fact the words "منهم" (from amongst them) which appears after has been mentioned specifically to exclude them.

The reply to this form of argument is in actual fact not our responsibility because this very argument can be brought by the Khawārij and Nawāṣib against the Shīʿah, so they too will have to respond.

Nevertheless, to console both the Shīʿah and Ahl al-Sunnah we will reply.

The disputes of the Ṣaḥābah were also on account of their compassion for each other

Distress can be caused by two things:

1. Animosity
2. Love

The distress which arises on account of animosity is evident and is the same anguish and distress a person experiences from his enemy.

As for the distress one experiences on account of love: this is when a person acts contrary to the desires of his friend, the distress or anguish one feels in this instance is because of love. If a stranger were to have made such remarks then it would not have hurt, which makes it clear that the cause of this distress is love. If this love had not existed then there would have been no distress. If this can be understood in light of the Ṣaḥābah then much has been understood and the words of the Qur'ān will have to be accepted.

We seek Allah's protection, Allah Taʿālā is not deceptive and a liar similar to the likes of Zurārah ibn Aʿyun, Muḥammad ibn ʿAlī al-Aḥwal (Shayṭān al-Ṭāq), etc who were labelled as liars by the 'infallible' A'immah and the books of the Shīʿah (which will be discussed shortly). Those who have become accustomed to accepting such implausible narrations from such deceptive narrators, why will they ever accept the truth, even if it is spoken by the All-Truthful Allah?

The credibility of the narrators upon whose narrations Shīʿasm is founded

Furthermore, according to the Shīʿah, the books of the Ahl al-Sunnah cannot be relied upon, but we would like to ask them about the condition of their narrators upon which their dīn is based and who are the link to their 'infallible' A'immah. Their conditions are such that the likes of Hishām ibn Sālim, al-Maythamī, al-Aḥwal al-Ṭāq, etc, who are the leaders, fore-runners and chief narrators of the Shīʿah; cannot be discussed completely in this brief treatise. However as a way of example I will make mention of a few of these reports.

Al-Kulaynī reports in al-Kāfī:

> عن ابراهيم محمد بن الخزار و محمد بن الحسين قالا دخلنا على ابى الحسين الرضا عليه السلام فقلنا ان هشام بن السالم و الميثمى و الصاحب الطاق يقولون ان الله تعالى اجوف الى السرة و الباقى صمد فخر لله ساجدا ثم قال سبحانك ما عرفوك و لا وحدوك فمن اجل ذلك وصفوك
>
> Ibrāhīm ibn Muḥammad ibn al-Khazzār and Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥusayn both narrate: "We entered upon Abū al-Ḥusayn al-Riḍā رحمه الله and we mentioned to him that Hishām bin Sālim, al-Maythamī and Ṣāhib al-Ṭāq are saying that verily Allah is hollow up to the navel, and the rest is solid." On hearing this, Imām Riḍā رحمه الله fell into prostration and supplicated: "Subḥān Allāh! They neither know You nor do they profess your Oneness, this is the reason why they describe You (in this manner)."

The second narration has also been narrated by al-Kulaynī.

> عن على بن حمزة قال قلت لابى عبد الله عليه السلام سمعت هشام بن الحكم يروى عنكم ان الله جسم صمدى نورى معرفته ضرورة يمن بها على من يشاء من خلقه فقال عليه السلام سبحان من لا يعلم احد كيف ليس كمثله شيء و هو السميع البصير
>
> ʿAlī ibn Ḥamzah narrates that he said to Imām Jaʿfar رحمه الله: "I heard Hishām ibn al-Ḥakam reporting on your authority that Allah is a heavy strong body of celestial light, whose recognition is incumbent, which he grants to whomsoever He wishes." Imām Jaʿfar رحمه الله replied: "Glory be to that Being

> whose form is not known to anyone. There is nothing like Him. He is All-Hearing, All-Seeing."

Just marvel at these narrations, the knowledge which these fore-runners of the Shīʿah have ascribed to the illustrious A'immah. In fact, some of these leaders, such as Zurārah ibn Aʿyun, Bakr bin Aʿyun, Sulaymān Jaʿfarī, Muḥammad ibn Muslim, etc, believed that Allah Taʿālā is ignorant of the future. To what extent should I continue discussing their false beliefs? Such are the people who transmit crucial matters of dīn for the Shīʿah and it is their narrations that they consider authentic. It is their fictitious tales which they gather in their books and then dubbed them with the title of *Ṣiḥāḥ* (authentic books), which are then accepted by all their scholars.

Even if the Shīʿī scholars, out of habit (for falsehood), happen to refute these narrations when in the presence of the scholars of the Ahl al-Sunnah, they still believe in them firmly with their hearts.

All praise belongs to Allah! It is only the Ahl al-Sunnah that when they say *Ṣiḥāḥ* (authentic books) then be assured that those books comprise only of those narrations transmitted by reliable, credible and pious individuals. If any narrations have been transmitted from unreliable sources, then it was only to show the defects of those narrations so that people will be saved from being deceived by it, which is why they state thereafter that this narration is weak and that one is fabricated.

The crux of the matter is when this is the state of the fundamental narrations of the Shīʿī faith then what need be said of the historical accounts (which are lesser in credibility). The narrations of the Ahl al-Sunnah have already been deemed unreliable (by the Shīʿah) so why then will those narrations reported about the disagreements of the Ṣaḥābah have any relevance against what has been stated in the Qur'ān? At the end of the day, it is the Qur'ān that is mutawātir.

Thus, when the Qur'ān says that they were "Compassionate amongst each other"

and according to your understanding (i.e. the Shīʿah), this means that they had absolutely no disagreements with each other whatsoever, then in accordance with the principle that all those narrations which contradict the Qur'ān are rejected; all those narrations which mention some disagreement between them will be deemed unreliable.

By the grace of Allah, after all necessary aspects of this verse have been discussed, it is incumbent upon us to present such a verse which testifies to the piety of the Ṣaḥābah, as clear as daylight, which can be easily understood and will also indicate their end being upon virtue. Therefore we present the sixth verse before you:

وَالسّٰبِقُوْنَ الْاَوَّلُوْنَ مِنَ الْمُهٰجِرِيْنَ وَالْاَنْصَارِ وَالَّذِيْنَ اتَّبَعُوْهُمْ بِاِحْسَانٍ ۙ رَّضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهُمْ وَرَضُوْا عَنْهُ وَ اَعَدَّ لَهُمْ جَنّٰتٍ تَجْرِيْ تَحْتَهَا الْاَنْهٰرُ خٰلِدِيْنَ فِيْهَآ اَبَدًا ؕ ذٰلِكَ الْفَوْزُ الْعَظِيْمُ ﴿١٠٠﴾

> Allah is pleased with the fore-runners of the muhājirīn, the anṣār, and those who followed them in doing good, and they are pleased with Him. He has prepared for them such gardens beneath which rivers flow, in which they shall live forever. This is the ultimate success.[1]

After this verse, if ʿAmmār ʿAlī truly seeks the truth then he will have no delay in doing so. Even one who has been indoctrinated for years with Shīʿī beliefs will discover the truth after reading this verse. Why should they not accept the truth when Allah Taʿālā in his infinite wisdom left no avenue or doorway in this verse for those who argue against the Ṣaḥābah.

The reason for Allah's pleasure in this verse rests only upon Hijrah

If Īmān or the performance of righteous deeds were mentioned to be the reason for attaining Allah's pleasure then perhaps the Shīʿah, Khawārij and Nawāṣib could have said that this promise is only for those who have īmān and do righteous

1 Sūrah Taubah: 100

deeds and they did not have īmān. The first three khulafā, Zubayr, Ṭalḥah رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ and others being amongst the fore-runners of the muhājirīn is nothing unknown that can be possibly denied or said to be a fabrication. More so for the first khalīfah, Abū Bakr رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ, as his hijrah even precedes that of ʿAlī رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ and he is regarded as the first of the fore-runners of the muhājirīn. In this instance, this verse will point to his superiority because all the promises mentioned in this verse are on account of hijrah, so accordingly he who surpassed others in hijrah will also surpass others in deserving this promise being fulfilled for him. It is well-known that when Rasūlullāh صَلَّى ٱللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ left his home to perform hijrah, he first came to the house of Abū Bakr رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ and they left together. All others only left after them.

The difference between hijrah to Abyssinia and hijrah to Madīnah

Even though the hijrah to Abyssinia took place before the hijrah to Madīnah, it does not surpass the hijrah to Madīnah. The permissibility of migrating to Abyssinia was only on account of inability to endure the severe hardships being inflicted upon the Muslims. It had become very difficult to remain steadfast on dīn in Makkah and therefore the weak were permitted to migrate in order to preserve their īmān and lives. This is why Rasūlullāh صَلَّى ٱللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ was not permitted to migrate to Abyssinia, and even if someone were to present some far-fetched reason for Rasūlullāh صَلَّى ٱللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ not being ordered to migrate, they will have no answer as to why those who did not migrate to Abyssinia were not rebuked.

On the other hand, the objective of migrating to Madīnah was for the sake of supporting and strengthening dīn, thus migrating to Madīnah cannot be termed to be a concession but was rather a strict order. This is why those who failed to migrate were severely reprimanded. The migration to Abyssinia being a concession and the migration to Madīnah being an instruction, aside from being common knowledge, is even clearer after this explanation. However, to further elaborate my point the difference between the two is understood from the fact that migrating to Madīnah was in effect taking a gamble with one's life whereas migrating to Abyssinia was to save one's life. Migration to Madīnah was to

strengthen the dīn whereas migrating to Abyssinia was so one could perform his ṣalāh and ṣowm in peace. Migration to Madīnah was to support Rasūlullāh ﷺ whereas the migration to Abyssinia left him alone in Makkah. In the case of migrating to Madīnah they were beaten, killed and had to fight against their own leaders and family, whereas when migrating to Abyssinia they saved themselves from the hands of the enemy and could live in peace. Thus the migration to

Abyssinia is not worthy of praise and more so not the praise of Allah Taʿālā.

The verse refers only to the migration to Madīnah

This is the reason why neither of the two groups consider this verse to refer to the migration to Abyssinia nor did they regard it to be expounding its virtues. The reason for this apparently is that this verse as well as others like it were all revealed after the hijrah to Madīnah and these verses in addition to mentioning the virtues of the muhājirīn also mention the virtues of the anṣār. In Sūrah Ḥashar, the words:

يَنْصُرُوْنَ اللّٰه

> They help the dīn of Allah.

also appear which indicate that these virtues pertain to the assistance and aid the anṣār rendered to the muhājirīn when they migrated towards them. If there was a hijrah that fits this description then it is only the hijrah to Madīnah. In the hijrah to Abyssinia there were no anṣār nor was there any aid to speak of. Nevertheless, the precedence of Abū Bakr, ʿUmar, ʿUthmān, ʿAlī, Ṭalḥah, Zubayr رضي الله عنهم and others is something undeniable.

This verse does not make known the pleasure of Allah but also the highest level of īmān and good deeds

On account of this precedence in hijrah, Allah Taʿālā says that He is pleased with them. This in itself is sufficient praise as there is nothing greater than attaining

the pleasure of Allah. If Allah is pleased with a person then one can safely conclude that they have the highest form of īmān, which cannot be described and their actions too of the highest calibre. Thus, it will corroborate entirely with the verse mentioned previously:

وَعَدَ اللّٰهُ الَّذِيْنَ اٰمَنُوْا وَ عَمِلُوا الصّٰلِحٰتِ مِنْهُمْ مَّغْفِرَةً وَّ اَجْرًا عَظِيْمًا ﴿١٠﴾

> Allah has promised forgiveness and a grand reward for those of them who have īmān and who do good deeds.

This leaves no room to doubt them ever being forgiven because the revered personalities mentioned above were all with Rasūlullāh ﷺ at Ḥudaybiyyah (where this verse was revealed).

Continuous glad tidings of Jannah can only indicate one's end being good

In addition to this, Allah stated that gardens of Jannah have been prepared for them wherein they will remain forever. If any person were to now doubt their piety, it can only mean that according to him piety means that Allah is displeased with a person and has prepared the fire of Jahannam for him. So those Shīʿah, who speak ill against these noble personalities and instead regard their enemies to be pious, possibly do so on account of this definition of piety. However, in this instance it would necessitate that they absolve themselves from Amīr al-Mu'minīn ʿAlī رضي الله عنه as well, since he is also amongst those who were given these glad tidings. What can be said about those who speak ill of these friends of Allah, who belie Allah Taʿālā as well; calling them (the Ṣaḥābah) sinners and kāfir? This only results in them labelling themselves as sinners and kuffār.

> One who claims the sun has no light
> Does not testify against the sun but his own lack of sight

Whichever objections the Shīʿah raise against the Ṣaḥābah can be raised by the Khawārij against ʿAlī رضي الله عنه

I wish to also add to the above, it is possible that some prejudiced individual might say that Allah Taʿālā was pleased with the Ṣaḥābah at first but then became angry with them because of their opposition to the khilāfah of ʿAlī رضي الله عنه, and the fact that Jannah had been prepared for them does not necessitate that they will not be punished. In fact it is quite possible that they will be punished first and only thereafter enter Jannah.

In reality such an assertion needs no reply, especially when this question is raised by the Shīʿah, because these same doubts may be raised by the Khawārij against ʿAlī رضي الله عنه such that they may also claim that the promise of forgiveness refers to the forgiveness that will be granted after punishment.

> The hole he dug for others was the very same in which he fell

The Ṣaḥābah will not be disgraced on the Day of Qiyāmah, and the kuffār and the sinful do not attain Allah's pleasure

This is why it is said that it has been first mentioned in Sūrah al-Taḥrīm:

يَوْمَ لَا يُخْزِى اللّٰهُ النَّبِىَّ وَ الَّذِيْنَ اٰمَنُوْا مَعَهٗ

> On that Day (Qiyāmah) Allah shall not disgrace the Nabī صلى الله عليه وسلم and the Mu'minīn with him.[1]

Thus, even the Shīʿah cannot criticise their īmān. Furthermore, Allah Taʿālā says:

فَاِنَّ اللّٰهَ لَا يُحِبُّ الْكٰفِرِيْنَ

> Indeed Allah does not love the disbelievers.

1 Sūrah al-Taḥrīm: 8

In another verse, Allah Taʿālā says:

فَاِنَّ اللّٰهَ لَا يَرْضٰى عَنِ الْقَوْمِ الْفٰسِقِيْنَ ﴿٩٦﴾

Indeed Allah is not pleased with the wrong doers.[1]

Therefore, if Allah is pleased with the Ṣaḥābah then there is doubt in their belief in Rasūlullāh ﷺ. In addition, there is no possibility of them having been pious only for a short period during the life of Rasūlullāh ﷺ. Thus, in accordance with the promise of Allah, they will be honoured and respected on the Day of Qiyāmah with Rasūlullāh ﷺ. So how then can they be punished on the Day of Qiyāmah, when there is no greater disgrace then punishment on that Day? It is possible however that those with obscure understanding may understand this (honour being granted to the Ṣaḥābah) to actually be punishment.

Secondly, Allah Taʿālā says in Sūrah al-Ambiyā':

اِنَّ الَّذِيْنَ سَبَقَتْ لَهُمْ مِّنَّا الْحُسْنٰى ۙ اُولٰٓئِكَ عَنْهَا مُبْعَدُوْنَ لَا يَسْمَعُوْنَ حَسِيْسَهَا ۚ وَ هُمْ فِىْ مَا اشْتَهَتْ اَنْفُسُهُمْ خٰلِدُوْنَ لَا يَحْزُنُهُمُ الْفَزَعُ الْاَكْبَرُ وَ تَتَلَقّٰهُمُ الْمَلٰٓئِكَةُ ؕ هٰذَا يَوْمُكُمُ الَّذِىْ كُنْتُمْ تُوْعَدُوْنَ ﴿١٠١﴾

Indeed those for whom We have ordained the best (Jannah), they shall be kept far from Jahannam. They will not even hear its whisper. They will live forever in whatever they desire. The greatest fright (Qiyāmah) shall not distress them and angels will meet them (saying to them): "This is your day that you had been promised."[2]

Now ponder, Allah has promised a great success for them and assured them with such comforting words; to now regard such people deserving of punishment can only be the assumption of the foolish. The promise being made before hand also

1 Sūrah al-Taubah: 96

2 Sūrah al-Ambiyā': 101

clearly indicates the same, and in the hereafter they will be re-assured of the promise that was made to them. To now claim that they will still be punished is an accusation that Allah will not fulfil His promise, Allah forbid. Allah Taʿālā is not the same as the Shīʿah, who practice *taqiyyah* (dissimulation) today and say whatever is required, then later go back on their word.

The disputes between the Ṣaḥābah does not necessitate kufr or sin of either party since both negate Allah's pleasure

It is evident from the above that the battles or disputes that took place against ʿAlī رضي الله عنه will neither necessitate kufr nor sin, as the Shīʿah assert. If so, then why did Allah Taʿālā declare his pleasure for them, when he said:

فَاِنَّ اللّٰهَ لَا يُحِبُّ الْكٰفِرِيْنَ

> Indeed Allah does not love the disbelievers.

فَاِنَّ اللّٰهَ لَا يَرْضٰى عَنِ الْقَوْمِ الْفٰسِقِيْنَ

> Indeed Allah is not pleased with the wrong doers.

In fact, even denying the imāmah of ʿAlī رضي الله عنه does not necessitate kufr or sin because according to the Shīʿah all the muhājirīn and anṣār, with the exception of a few, denied his imāmah. Further supporting this is the narration of ʿAlī رضي الله عنه reported in *Nahj al-Balāghah*, one of the most relied upon works of the Shīʿah. In this narration, ʿAlī رضي الله عنه said to Muʿāwiyah رضي الله عنه:

اصحبنا نقاتل اخواننا فى الاسلام على ما دخل فيه من الزيغ و الاعوجاج

> We fight our Muslim brothers on account of the crookedness and deviation that has entered into dīn.

This proves that those who deny his imāmah and fought against him are not kāfir and Muʿāwiyah رضي الله عنه, despite his denial of the imāmah of ʿAlī رضي الله عنه and opposition

to ʿAlī رضي الله عنه which is well-known to all, was still a Muslim in the opinion of ʿAlī رضي الله عنه. Thus, if one wishes to secure the beliefs of the Shīʿah faith, he will have to deny and refute all those narrations reporting disputes and disagreements between the Ṣaḥābah and ʿAlī رضي الله عنه. If they refuse to do so then they will have to deny these verses of the Qur'ān. After all, ʿUthmān رضي الله عنه concealed the virtue and right of imāmah of ʿAlī رضي الله عنه by removing approximately eleven thousand verses of the Qur'ān (according to the Shīʿah paradigm), even though concealing the laws of dīn is a sin but deemed meritorious by the Shīʿah belief of taqiyyah. So when fighting against ʿAlī رضي الله عنه does not necessitate kufr and even denial of his imāmah does not render one a kāfir or a sinner, even though this is the third part of īmān of the Ithnā ʿAshariyyah Shīʿah, the other sins which are definitely lesser than this; how will it necessitate kufr? In light of this, even Muʿāwiyah رضي الله عنه and his companions should be free from the slander of the Shīʿah.

Nonetheless, the verse: "The fore-runners of the Muhājirīn, the Anṣār" has rendered a strong and crushing reply to the Shīʿah argument, such that one cannot even claim that these three Ṣaḥābah (viz. Abū Bakr, ʿUmar and ʿUthmān رضي الله عنهم) and others only embraced Islam after this verse was revealed because this verse is in Sūrah al-Taubah, which was revealed two years before the demise of Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم and these Ṣaḥābah all embraced Islam in Makkah. It is also not possible for anyone to attach the words *ihsān* (good deeds) as a clause to the muhājirīn and anṣār because ihsān is attached to the word "اتبعوهم" (those who follow them) which is a separate sentence.

The words of the verse: "Superior in Rank" establishes superiority of the Ṣaḥābah over the A'immah

In addition to the above, this verse and a few others related to it establishes the superiority of the three Ṣaḥābah (viz. Abū Bakr, ʿUmar, ʿUthmān رضي الله عنهم) and in fact all the muhājirīn and anṣār. This reduces to dust another belief of the Shīʿah, namely that the A'immah of the Shīʿah are superior to the entire ummah and the ambiyā' as well. This belief is refuted entirely by the Qur'ān because the verse in Sūrah al-Taubah states that those of the Ṣaḥābah who brought īmān, performed

hijrah, and waged Jihād in the path of Allah with their lives and wealth, they have surpassed every person in this ummah. This superiority is general and includes superiority over the A'immah as well. We learn from this that besides ʿAlī رضي الله عنه none of the A'immah could reach the level of these Ṣaḥābah, let alone the status of the ambiyā'.

The verse which we refer to is:

الَّذِيْنَ اٰمَنُوْا وَهَاجَرُوْا وَجٰهَدُوْا فِيْ سَبِيْلِ اللّٰهِ بِاَمْوَالِهِمْ وَاَنْفُسِهِمْ ۙ اَعْظَمُ دَرَجَةً عِنْدَ اللّٰهِ ؕ وَ اُولٰٓئِكَ
هُمُ الْفَآئِزُوْنَ ﴿٢٠﴾ يُبَشِّرُهُمْ رَبُّهُمْ بِرَحْمَةٍ مِّنْهُ وَ رِضْوَانٍ وَّجَنّٰتٍ لَّهُمْ فِيْهَا نَعِيْمٌ مُّقِيْمٌ ﴿٢١﴾ خٰلِدِيْنَ فِيْهَآ
اَبَدًا ؕ اِنَّ اللّٰهَ عِنْدَهٗٓ اَجْرٌ عَظِيْمٌ ﴿٢٢﴾

Those who have īmān, who make hijrah and exert themselves in Allah's path with their wealth and their lives are superior in rank according to Allah. These are the successful ones. Their Rabb gives them the good news of His mercy, pleasure and such gardens where they shall have everlasting bounties. They will live there forever. Undoubtedly with Allah is a great reward.[1]

1 Sūrah Taubah: 20-22

Chapter four

The belief of badā’ and the confusion of the Shīʿah scholars

The Shīʿī scholars will now have no choice except to acknowledge the superiority of the Ṣaḥābah or they will have to resort to the principle:

الضرورة تبيح المحظورات

> Necessity permits the prohibited.

and thereafter return to their age old tenet and say:

> We accept that the Qur’ān proves what the Ahl al-Sunnah claims it does but what reliance can be placed on Allah? (Allah forbid!) Just as (according to our Shīʿī belief, whether you believe it or not) Allah experienced badā’ in many aspects of dīn, He experienced badā’ regarding the status of the Ṣaḥābah, the Ahl al-Sunnah, and even in protecting the Qur’ān. Allah Taʿālā first had the intention that is mentioned in the Qur’ān but later changed his mind and this is the meaning of badā’.

Definitions of badā’

First definition

Nizām al-dīn al-Jilānī, whom the present day Shīʿah might perhaps call a munāfiq, writes in his book *ʿIlm al-Hudā fi Taḥqīq al-Badā’*:

يقال بدا له إذا ظهر له رأي مخالف للرأي الأول

> One will say he experienced badā’ when an opinion contrary to his former opinion becomes apparent to him.

Nizāmu al-dīn al-Jilānī writes in this same book that Abū Jaʿfar al-Ṭūsī and Shaykh Abū al-Fath al-Karājakī had the same opinion regarding the meaning of badā’

because this is what al-Ṭūsī has written in his book, *ʿUddah*, and al-Karājakī in *Kanz al-Fawāʿid*.

Second definition

However, what Sharīf al-Murtaḍā has written in his book, *al-Dhariʿah*, (and the words of al-Ṭabarsī gives off the same stench) contradicts the meaning above because he writes:

معنى قولنا بدا له تعالى أنه ظهر له من الأمر ما لم يكن ظاهراً

> The meaning of our statement that Allah experienced badā' is that something became apparent to Allah which was not apparent before.

Thereafter Nizām al-dīn adds:

> The gist of this is that Allah learns of new things after they occur.

After this, he presents his own findings, which supports the second meaning, that at times Allah may experience badā' when giving information of future events. In simple words, sometimes Allah may say what is going to transpire and it does not come to pass.

Third definition

The later Shīʿah came to realise the mess this belief of badā' has caused and felt somewhat ashamed at the objections and criticisms raised by the Ahl al-Sunnah. Thus they changed its meaning and said that badā' only applies to that knowledge which Allah does not inform anyone of, whereas in that knowledge sent to the ambiyā' Allah Taʿālā does not lie. If the Shīʿah adhere firmly to this view then they will receive a warm welcome and applause from the Ahl al-Sunnah. In that case, the words of Allah will be absolutely correct and on account of the Shīʿī belief of badā' there will no longer be any need to prove our claim from another source besides the Qur'ān.

However, Nizām al-dīn al-Jilānī knew that to overcome the criticism of the Ahl al-Sunnah and establish their view, he would have to adhere to the confusing and embarrassing view of badā’, and refute the few later Shīʿī scholars by claiming that this only applies to a specific type of knowledge. He reported numerous narrations from Shīʿī literature which utterly refutes the opinion of the later Shīʿī scholars. And why will he not, when he is a research scholar himself? This is why he wrote a special treatise on this subject. He mentions that whatever Allah Taʿālā stated was indeed the truth because it will only be considered a lie when it is intentional. So when Allah Taʿālā was misinformed, Allah forbid, what fault of it is His that warrants the later Shīʿī scholars to say that Allah Taʿālā never lies to His close servants.

Three types of badā’

In short from all the narrations that Nizām al-dīn al-Jilānī quoted to prove his claim, it is proven that there are three types of badā’.

1. *Badā’ fi l-ʿIlm*:- Allah had knowledge of something but only later the true reality became apparent.

2. *Badā’ fi l-Irādah*:- Allah initially intended to do something but then later realised that this was not the correct course of action.

3. *Badā’ fi l-Amr*:- Allah initially gave a command but then realised that this command was a mistake and then replaced it with a new one that does not have the same deficiency and is more suitable with the need of the hour.

The difference between badā’ and naskh

One should not confuse badā’ with *naskh* (abrogation) because naskh means that a specific ruling has come to an end and the time for another ruling has commenced. An example of this is the month of Ramadān, wherein fasting is compulsory but when the day of ʿĪd arrives then the ruling comes to an end and it is now time to stop fasting. It is not said that there was an error in the first

ruling and therefore it was suspended, but rather the period of the ruling has come to an end and now the time for a new ruling has commenced. However, at times the time for the termination of the ruling may be given, such as in the example above, and at times it may not be given, but it will still terminate at its appointed time, for example the Sharīʿah of Nabī Īsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ was to last until the arrival of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and this was only known to Allah. If any person was aware of this then he still did not know what the period would be and when would Rasūlullāh صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ arrive. In essence *badā' fi l-Amr*, which is also called *badā' fi al-Taklīf* by the Shīʿah, is something entirely different from naskh. In the case of badā' it would mean that first Allah Taʿālā ordered the fast of Ramadān and seeing that that there was no problem with it, maintained his instruction, but after sometime saw that it does not serve the need of the hour and therefore changed his order.

The three types of badā' each require the other

Once this is understood then listen further to this unworthy one; when *badā' fi al-Taklīf* occurs then *badā' fi l-Irādah*, also known as *badā' fi al-Takwīn*, will also necessarily occur. The reason for this is that *badā' fi l-Irādah* is that change in decree which occurs on the discovery of a new requirement. So if the ruling was changed on account of a new benefit then the intention for the initial ruling has also changed. Similarly, *badā' fi l-Irādah* will necessitate the occurrence of *badā' fi l-ʿIlm*, also known as *badā' fi l-Akhbār*. The reason for this is that if the intention changes when a new requirement is 'learnt', then it would mean that the knowledge acquired now was not known before and what was known before was ultimately incorrect, which in itself is known as *badā' fi l-ʿIlm*.

Therefore, if any Shīʿah believes in the occurrence of *badā' fi l-Amr* and *badā' fi l-Irādah,* but only to save face before the Ahl al-Sunnah distances himself from the belief of *badā' fi l-Akhbār*, then too this scheme will not work.

In short the concept of badā' is an accepted concept amongst the Shīʿah and if anyone of them were to reply to this verse, in an effort to save themselves from

the argument of the Ahl al-Sunnah, by saying:

> If you are able to prove your case from the Qur'ān then we accept that this is what the Book of Allah says but what reliance can be placed upon the Qur'ān (Allah forbid)? Allah changes his opinion often and (Allah forbid) right, wrong, correct, incorrect, can all be found in His Book. Our A'immah on the other hand have knowledge of what happened and what is still to happen, so if the piety and integrity of the Ṣaḥābah were to be proven from their word instead then we would definitely accept it.

The consequences of the belief of badā'

The forgiveness of the four infallibles becomes doubtful

In this case, it would become incumbent upon us to dispose of the proof of the Shīʿah as well, as all fair-minded people would, because if this is the consequence of badā' then the first aspect that would come under question would be the forgiveness of the four 'infallibles', Allah forbid, so what guarantee do the Shīʿah now have? Just as the forgiveness promised to the Ṣaḥābah has been discarded under the concept of badā', if the same were to have occurred with the A'immah then please do tell us what authority the A'immah have over Allah Taʿālā? Especially since their taqiyyah and lack of courage (Allah forbid) has made a mockery of the entire dīn.

The extended absence of the final Imām is a sad plight indeed

In addition, the final Imām has opted to remain hidden, despite his absolute knowledge of his enemies and friends. He must definitely be aware that every year in Iran, thousands of Shīʿah faithful come out in the streets wailing and pleading for his arrival, prepared to sacrifice their lives and wealth. In India, Shī'asm is spreading daily, and every Shīʿah eagerly awaits the arrival of the Imām.

Yet even though his life is in his control and he knows that he will not die before his appointed time (which is also known to him), he chooses to remain hidden. It

is uncertain what bravery and courage this is; such that even though his devotees increase by the day, he goes further and further into confinement, refusing to come forth. Even if there was something to fear, what of it; Rasūlullāh ﷺ had a mere three hundred and thirteen men around him and he waged jihād and then too, according to the Shīʿah, majority of them were munāfiqīn, and those who were not munāfiqīn, were not as sincere and devoted as the Imāmiyyah are to their final Imām. Our astonishment will continue but still the occultation of the final Imām will not end, despite the peace, support and power he has at his hands. This can only mean that the A'immah having knowledge of the past, present and future is false, or the love which the Shīʿah profess is false. We know for a fact that under the pretence of love, the Shīʿah have ascribed numerous weaknesses to their A'immah, a few of which will become apparent to the readers in this treatise.

Perhaps Allah experienced badā' when appointing the A'immah

In essence, the final Imām refuses to come forth from his cave in Surra min Ra'ā, despite the insistence and pleas of his supporters and he refuses to do anything about the deviation and plight of the ummah. What greater deviation can there be than the dīn of Muḥammad ﷺ being replaced by the "dīn of Abū Bakr", the Book of Allah being replaced by the "Pages of ʿUthmān", and the twelve A'immah being replaced by the likes of Imām Abū Ḥanīfah, Imām Shāfiʿī, etc (as the Shīʿah assert); that one should continue waiting. The other A'immah were excused on account of them not having any supporters or assistance but what excuse does the twelfth Imām have? The only possible answer to all of this, if we were to accept the Shīʿī concept of badā'; is that Allah made a mistake (Allah forbid) in appointing the A'immah whereas he should have appointed Abū Bakr, ʿUmar and ʿUthmān رضي الله عنهم as the A'immah, who would have lit the lamps of guidance and provided peace to all this chaos. Thus, the Imāmiyyah have no other explanation for this delay but the above (that badā' has taken place). If on the other hand, they were to say that it is not incumbent upon Allah to do as is required by man then they could say:

لَا يَسْئَلُ عَمَّا يَفْعَلُ وَهُمْ يُسْئَلُوْنَ

> None can question Him about What He does but all of them will be questioned (about their actions).

The twelfth Imām has been deposed by Allah because of badāʾ

Thus, it would not be strange that amongst the badāʾ that occurred, badāʾ also was experienced regarding the twelfth Imām and he has been deposed. This would explain why the absence of the Imām has passed the calculated date of his arrival. This would mean that the belief (of the Shīʿah) that Abū Bakr and ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهُمَا, etc will be resurrected in the last days of this world is not incorrect and since the twelfth Imām has been deposed, they will be resurrected to take his place. Thus the Shīʿah were mistaken in believing that they will be resurrected to be punished. Nevertheless, this discussion must have been displeasing to the Shīʿah.

Refutation of badāʾ from the Qurʾān

Therefore for the sake of the Shīʿah, I will refrain from this and reply that even if Allah Taʿālā could err (as the Shīʿah suggest), he did not err with the ambiyāʾ. We know that the Shīʿah also do not believe that Allah Taʿālā errs when relaying information of past events as this would be no less than a blatant lie. Once this is understood, I wish to add that in Sūrah Ṭāhā, Allah Taʿālā relates the incidents of Nabī Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام, which occurred long before the era of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّم, and mentions the reply Nabī Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام gave to Firʿoun:

لَا يَضِلُّ رَبِّيْ وَ لَا يَنْسَى

> My Rabb does not err, nor does He forget.[1]

Ponder over this verse, what is Allah saying? We all know Nabī Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام, even the Shīʿah will not say that he used to err. The Shīʿah have reserved this fault

---

1 Sūrah Ṭāhā: 52

solely for Allah Taʿālā as then it would necessitate that an infallible may err. In this case, the very criticism they make against the Ahl al-Sunnah, that the khulafā and A'immah (of the Ahl al-Sunnah) were not *maʿsūm* (infallible) whereas an imām or khalīfah must be infallible so that it can be possible to differentiate between truth and falsehood, will in actual fact apply to them as well.

The Shīʿah principle dictates that Allah may err but not the infallible A'immah

The principles of the Shīʿah inform us that it is possible for Allah to err but an infallible cannot. Thus, the statement of Nabī Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ, who was infallible according to consensus of both factions:

لَا يَضِلُّ رَبِّىْ وَ لَا يَنْسَى

My Rabb does not err, nor does He forget.

has no possibility of error. Furthermore, this incident is of the past and not anything still to transpire, which could fall in the category of *badā' fi l-Akhbār.* What then is the meaning of "My Rabb does not err nor does He forget"? (Allah forbid) Did some shortcoming befall the memory and senses of Allah Taʿālā in the era of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ? Abū Bakr and ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهُمَا were most definitely awe-inspiring personalities, but to the extent that they could strike awe into Allah Taʿālā? We seek Allah's refuge from such blasphemy, Allah Taʿālā is far greater and above such faults. In their attempts to mislead the Ahl al-Sunnah they have also cast the honour of Allah Taʿālā behind their backs. (The Shīʿah continue to assert that) When Fadak was taken, it was Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهُ who took it, when the pen and paper was not brought, it was ʿUmar رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهُ who did not bring it; and they absolved themselves from them, so now did Allah Taʿālā, who was aware of all of this, fail to assist those who were oppressed, even though assisting the oppressed is the path of truth? May Allah Taʿālā blacken the faces of these uncouth people. In essence, the Qur'ān uproots any possibility of badā' ever occurring.

The supplication of Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq against those who believe in badā’

If the Shīʿah do not have the slightest reliance in Allah and insist, considering it possible that Allah may have erred in relaying the incidents of the past, that we will not refute the belief of badā’ on the testimony of the Qur’ān until and unless al-Kulaynī reports a narration in this regard. Therefore we report the narrations of al-Kulaynī:

> عی منصور بن حازم عن ابی عبد الله قال منصور سالته هل یکون شیء لم یکن فی علم الله قال لا من قال هذا فاخزاه الله قلت ارئیت ما کان و ما هو کائن الی یوم القیامة لیس فی علم الله قال بلی قبل ان یخلق الخلق
>
> Mansūr ibn Hāzim narrates: “I asked Jaʿfar al-Sādiq رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّٰهُ whether there is anything that is not in the knowledge of Allah?” He replied: “No! May Allah disgrace whoever says (and believes) that.” I then asked him: “Do you believe that everything that has happened and what is still to happen until the Day of Qiyāmah is not in the knowledge of Allah?” He replied: “No! (He knew everything) Even before he created it.”

Two points are learnt from this narration:

1. Badā’ is an incorrect belief, because it has become clear from the problems that arise from this belief explained previously that it is impossible for Allah to acquire new knowledge (which was previously unknown to Him).

2. Jaʿfar Ṣādiq رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّٰهُ supplicated against those who adhere to the belief of badā’.

Thus, we too congratulate the Shīʿah. All these problems arose on account of them not understanding the Book of Allah and what fault of theirs is it? They do not even understand their own reports. If they had any understanding at all then they would have understood their books first, after all the Qur’ān is the Book of the Ahl al-Sunnah.

After understanding the truth, it is compulsory to accept

It is now incumbent to explain the motive of this erroneous belief so that further contentment may be gained and the readers will not be left in doubt and say: "Why should we abandon the belief of badā' simply on what is written in this treatise, after all our Shīʿī ʿulamā must have believed in this for a reason. So until we discuss this with them, we will not be content." This excuse is an epitome of the saying:

> The excuse for the sin is worse than the sin itself

When the truth has become clear then what need is there for him to wait on another. If one person watches the sun set with his naked eye and another sits in his home, staring at his watch waiting for the time of sunset; the one looking at the sun may be the most ignorant and the one sitting at home the greatest scholar, but the one gazing at the sun will not wait for confirmation from the one sitting at home.

Similarly, when it has become clear, in light of the Qur'ān and Shīʿī narration as well, that the belief of badā' is incorrect then why delay in accepting the truth. In this instance the most appropriate course of action would be that just as the one who gazes at the sun accepts that it has set without second thought, despite his ignorance, so too should those who have understood the error of badā' absolve themselves from it without second thought and say that those who believed in it, even though the most learned, were after all men and erred as all men do. They did not understand the verse of the Qur'ān:

إِنَّ اللّٰهَ كَانَ عَلِيْمًا حَكِيْمًا

> Verily Allah is All-Knowing, The Wise.[1]

nor did they understand the verse:

---

1 Sūrah al-Insān: 30

لَا يَضِلُّ رَبِّىْ وَ لَا يَنْسَى

My Rabb does not err, nor does He forget.

And they paid no attention to the narration of al-Kulaynī. In fact the most respectful thing to do would be to say that these people (who believed in badā’) did not memorise the Qur’ān, since it is the duty of the Ahl al-Sunnah to do so.

In essence, the excuse that the proofs of the Shīʿah need to be known first (before accepting the truth), after having understood the words of the Qur’ān, which have no alternate interpretation and the ḥadīth mentioned above, is not worthy of ear to those of intellect.

The foundation of the whimsical belief of badā’

However, ʿAmmār ʿAlī audaciously claimed that the cause of this erroneous belief amongst the Shīʿah is verses like:

الَّذِىْ خَلَقَ الْمَوْتَ وَ الْحَيٰوةَ لِيَبْلُوَكُمْ اَيُّكُمْ اَحْسَنُ عَمَلًا

Allah has created death and life so as to test which amongst you carry out the best deeds.[1]

On account of this verse and others similar to it, the Shīʿī ʿulamā believed that a test takes place where the end result is not known. He then went further and said that Allah Taʿālā says in another verse:

يَمْحُوا اللّٰهُ مَا يَشَآءُ وَيُثْبِتُ

Allah erases whatever He will and keeps in place (whatever He wills).[2]

1 Sūrah al-Mulk: 2

2 Sūrah al-Raʿd: 39

When they studied this verse with the verse mentioned previously, the Shīʿī ʿulamā were convinced that Allah Taʿālā was unaware of the true reality of matters and instead wherever He has expressed an opinion at first and later discovered it to be different, He changed His opinion and this is the meaning of badā'. In short, this is the manner in which the belief of badā' found its way into Shīʿī theology. The error which was first committed on account of lack of understanding was just reinforced further.

The harm of no teacher

Why should they not misunderstand such verses? Those without a teacher (and attempt to traverse the path of learning on their own) always falter. If they were to have approached the experts in the field of studying the Qur'ān then they would not have committed such an error. However, this sect is so unfortunate that they are the severe enemies of those who understand the Qur'ān. The Ṣaḥābah, who were the students of Rasūlullāh ﷺ, were the ones who understood the Qur'ān; so those who benefited from the Ṣaḥābah, will they understand the Qur'ān or the Shīʿah?

The objective of testing man is not to gain new knowledge

If one were to conclude from the verse above that Allah does not have knowledge of anything before creating it, which the Shīʿah believe, then Allah Taʿālā has said in numerous places in the Qur'ān:

اِنَّ اللّٰهَ بِمَا تَعْمَلُوْنَ بَصِيْرٌ

> Indeed Allah sees whatever you are doing.[1]

Thus, even if we were to accept that Allah Taʿālā did not have knowledge of one's actions before creating him, Allah Taʿālā makes it clear that he has complete knowledge of all that one does, so what further thought is required on this? Allah

1 Sūrah al-Baqarah: 110

is not dependent upon the light of the sun, He does not require light to see, the front and back are both equal to Him because He states:

اَلَآ اِنَّهٗ بِكُلِّ شَیْءٍ مُّحِیْطٌ

> Allah surrounds everything.[1]

In essence, once things have come into existence then there is no doubt that Allah sees them and then there is no possibility of Allah ever forgetting as Allah Taʿālā has said in Sūrah Tāhā,

لَا یَضِلُّ رَبِّیْ وَ لَا یَنْسَی

> My Rabb does not err nor does he forget.

So now what need is there to appoint the *al-Kirām al-Kātibīn* (angels who record the deeds of man), and that the reckoning on the Day of Qiyāmah only take place after man reads their Book of Deeds? Whatever reply the Shīʿah will give to this, will be our reply as well.

If their answer is that Allah knows every single thing; big or small, apparent or hidden, but Allah’s immense wisdom and grandeur dictates that system operate then we will accept it and this is our response as well. If the Shīʿah reply that taking reckoning from the Book of Deeds and the testimony of man’s hands and feet is to grant realisation to man then we also say that this test from Allah is to grant realisation to man.

If anyone doubts that the hands and feet of man will testify against him or that reckoning will be taken and the Deeds will be weighed then the following verses of the Noble Qur’ān are present:

1 Sūrah Ḥā Mīm Sajdah: 54

يَّوْمَ تَشْهَدُ عَلَيْهِمْ اَلْسِنَتُهُمْ وَ اَيْدِيْهِمْ وَ اَرْجُلُهُمْ بِمَا كَانُوْا يَعْمَلُوْنَ ﴿٢٤﴾

On the Day wherein their tongues, their hands and feet will testify against them with regard to their actions.[1]

The gist of which is that they will only be punished after their hands and feet testify against them. The following verse states the same:

وَقَالُوْا لِجُلُوْدِهِمْ لِمَ شَهِدْتُّمْ عَلَيْنَاؕ قَالُوْٓا اَنْطَقَنَا اللّٰهُ الَّذِیْٓ اَنْطَقَ كُلَّ شَیْءٍ

And they will say to their skin: "Why have you testified against us." It will reply: "Allah Taʿālā has made us speak, Who has granted everything its ability to speak."[2]

In addition, there are numerous other verses which prove that the deeds of man will be weighed on the Day of Qiyāmah:

وَالْوَزْنُ يَوْمَئِذِ ۨالْحَقُّ

The weighing on that day (of Qiyāmah) is the truth.[3]

وَ نَضَعُ الْمَوَازِيْنَ الْقِسْطَ لِيَوْمِ الْقِيٰمَةِ

On the Day of Qiyāmah, We will erect the scales of justice.[4]

فَاَمَّا مَنْ ثَقُلَتْ مَوَازِيْنُهٗ ۙ فَهُوَ فِیْ عِيْشَةٍ رَّاضِيَةٍ

As for him whose scales (actions) are weighty he shall be in a life of happiness.[5]

1 Sūrah al-Nūr: 24

2 Sūrah Ḥā Mīm Sajdah: 21

3 Sūrah al-Aʿrāf: 8

4 Sūrah al-Ambiyā': 47

5 Sūrah al-Qāriʿah

وَاِنْ تُبْدُوْا مَا فِيْٓ اَنْفُسِكُمْ اَوْ تُخْفُوْهُ يُحَاسِبْكُمْ بِهِ اللّٰهُ

> Whether you make known what is in your hearts or hide it, Allah will bring you to account for it.[1]

وَمَنْ يَّكْفُرْ بِاٰيٰتِ اللّٰهِ فَاِنَّ اللّٰهَ سَرِيْعُ الْحِسَابِ ﴿١٩﴾

> Whoever disbelieves in the revelations of Allah, verily Allah is swift in taking account.[2]

In short, these aspects cannot be denied. The Ithnā ʿAshariyyah and the Ahl al-Sunnah are both in agreement on this.

Whatever the Shīʿah will reply, we will not shy away from it. If they say that this will be done to merely complete the proof on man and if this were not the case then there would be no need for it then we too agree with it.

An example from the Qur’ān of completing proof against man

If one wishes to understand this by way of an example then understand this example, which even ʿAmmār ʿAlī accepts; the Shīʿah must remember Sūrah al-Baqarah? If they do not then they must remember a portion of it at least. In the first chapter, Allah Taʿālā mentions the incident when He intended to appoint Nabī Ādam عَلَيْهِ ٱلسَّلَامُ as his deputy on earth and the angels asked how could man be appointed as deputies when they will spread corruption and murder on earth, whilst they (the angels) are more deserving of such a position. They were the ones who glorified Allah, praised Allah but Allah Taʿālā replied to them:

> I know what you do not know.

However, to complete His proof on the angels, Allah Taʿālā taught Nabī Ādam عَلَيْهِ ٱلسَّلَامُ the names of a few items and then asked the angels to inform Him thereof:

1 Sūrah al-Baqarah: 284

2 Sūrah Āl Imrān: 19

"If you are truthful in your claim then answer my question." Since the angels had no knowledge of this, they replied:

سُبۡحٰنَكَ لَا عِلۡمَ لَنَاۤ اِلَّا مَا عَلَّمۡتَنَا ؕ اِنَّكَ اَنۡتَ الۡعَلِيۡمُ الۡحَكِيۡمُ ﴿٣٢﴾

> We proclaim Your purity! We possess only the knowledge that You have taught us. Without doubt, You are All Knowing, the Wise.[1]

When they could not answer, Allah Taʿālā ordered Nabī Ādam عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ to mention the name of those things and when he did, Allah said to the angels:

قَالَ اَلَمۡ اَقُلۡ لَّكُمۡ اِنِّىۡۤ اَعۡلَمُ غَيۡبَ السَّمٰوٰتِ وَالۡاَرۡضِ ۙ وَاَعۡلَمُ مَا تُبۡدُوۡنَ وَمَا كُنۡتُمۡ تَكۡتُمُوۡنَ ﴿٣٣﴾

> Did I not tell you that I know (all) the unseen things of the heavens and the earth, and that I know what you make known and what you hide?[2]

We ask the Shīʿah scholars, in the name of Allah, please ponder over this incident. Did Allah Taʿālā test the angels so that He could learn the reality or to provide clear proof to the angels? When Allah had already informed Nabī Ādam عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ of the answer and not informed the angels then even the most dim-witted person will not doubt Allah having knowledge of who is more deserving of being His deputy. Thus, just as this test was only to complete the proof against the angels and do away with their objections, so too is the test which Allah takes from man so that they will have no proof or argument against Allah.

Nubuwwah and establishing the laws of Sharīʿah is also to present a clear proof to man

This is also the reason for establishing the laws of Sharīʿah and the wisdom behind sending the ambiyā' because when the angels do not disobey Allah and are always obedient, as indicated by the verse:

---

1 Sūrah al-Baqarah: 32

2 Sūrah al-Baqarah: 33

لَّا يَعْصُوْنَ اللّٰهَ مَآ اَمَرَهُمْ وَ يَفْعَلُوْنَ مَا يُؤْمَرُوْنَ ﴿٦﴾

> They do not disobey the orders of Allah and they do what they are instructed.[1]

It is only man who objects to the decrees of Allah as man is after all human and amidst mention of the faults of man, Allah Taʿālā said:

وَكَانَ الْاِنْسَانُ اَكْثَرَ شَيْءٍ جَدَلًا ﴿٥٤﴾

> Man has always been the worst disputant (he quarrels anymore than, others of Allah’s creation).[2]

Thus, if Allah Taʿālā were to enter the ambiyā’ and the true believers into Jannah based upon His infinite knowledge, and Firʿoun, Abū Jahal and the disbelievers into Jahannam; would Firʿoun and Abū Jahal remain silent? No! They would raise objection after objection, continuously claiming that it is their right to enter Jannah. This is why the All-Mighty Allah Taʿālā has mentioned repeatedly in the Qur’ān the reason for this chain of guidance. We will mention one of these verses for the contentment of the readers:

وَ اتَّبِعُوْٓا اَحْسَنَ مَآ اُنْزِلَ اِلَيْكُمْ مِّنْ رَّبِّكُمْ مِّنْ قَبْلِ اَنْ يَّاْتِيَكُمُ الْعَذَابُ بَغْتَةً وَّ اَنْتُمْ لَا تَشْعُرُوْنَ ﴿٥٥﴾ اَنْ تَقُوْلَ نَفْسٌ يّٰحَسْرَتٰى عَلٰى مَا فَرَّطْتُّ فِيْ جَنْبِ اللّٰهِ وَ اِنْ كُنْتُ لَمِنَ السّٰخِرِيْنَ ﴿٥٦﴾ اَوْ تَقُوْلَ لَوْ اَنَّ اللّٰهَ هَدٰىنِيْ لَكُنْتُ مِنَ الْمُتَّقِيْنَ ﴿٥٧﴾ اَوْ تَقُوْلَ حِيْنَ تَرَى الْعَذَابَ لَوْ اَنَّ لِيْ كَرَّةً فَاَكُوْنَ مِنَ الْمُحْسِنِيْنَ ﴿٥٨﴾ بَلٰى قَدْ جَآءَتْكَ اٰيٰتِيْ فَكَذَّبْتَ بِهَا وَ اسْتَكْبَرْتَ وَكُنْتَ مِنَ الْكٰفِرِيْنَ ﴿٥٩﴾

> Follow the best, which your Rabb has revealed to you before punishment suddenly afflicts you without you realising it. (Do all this to avoid the situation after death when) A soul says: “Woe be to me for the neglect I showed with regard to Allah! In fact, I was from among those who mocked!” Or it says: “If only Allah had guided me, I would have certainly been from

1 Sūrah al-Taḥrīm: 6

2 Sūrah al-Kahaf: 54

> among those with taqwā (the mu'minīn)." Or it says when seeing the punishment: "If only I had a chance, I would certainly be from among those who do good (the mu'minīn)." (Allah will reply to such a soul by saying:) "Indeed, My āyāt (and My commands) came to you, but you rejected them, you were arrogant and were among the disbelievers."[1]

This was the translation of the verse. What was the reason for Allah Taʿālā saying: "Follow the best, which your Rabb has revealed to you"? The only possible reason was that there was the possibility of a person saying that if Allah Taʿālā had guided him then he would most definitely have been from amongst the pious. Such a complaint would only be possible if Allah Taʿālā had decided (without testing) who is destined for Jannah and who is destined for Jahannam. In this instance, the one who is cast into Jahannam will claim that he has not gotten what he deserved and complain as to why he was not tested first, as perhaps he would have been amongst the pious and Allah-fearing. Yet Allah Taʿālā has said:

وَكُنْتَ مِنَ الْكٰفِرِيْنَ ﴿٥٩﴾

> You were among the disbelievers.

And Allah Taʿālā did not say:

كَفَرْتَ

> You disbelieved.

Those who understand the Arabic language and its usage, know full-well that if Allah Taʿālā had said: "You disbelieved" then it would mean that you disbelieved when our verses came to you and that is when you became a kāfir and not before the verses were revealed. On the contrary, when Allah Taʿālā said: "You were among the disbelievers", then it means from before time already you were a kāfir and accordingly you still disbelieved when our signs came to you.

1 Sūrah al-Zumar: 55

Similarly in Sūrah al-Aʿrāf:

اَنْ تَقُوْلُوْا يَوْمَ الْقِيٰمَةِ اِنَّا كُنَّا عَنْ هٰذَا غٰفِلِيْنَ ﴿١٧٢﴾

So that you should not say on the Day of Qiyāmah: “We were unmindful about this promise.”[1]

In other words, the pledge which was taken when Allah Taʿālā asked:

اَلَسْتُ بِرَبِّكُمْ

Am I not your Rabb?

was so that at the time of punishment you should not give the excuse that you did not know. In reality, since man is as described previously (it is in his nature to argue), Allah Taʿālā instituted this test of *aʿamāl* (deeds) so that they will have no argument to present nor will they be able to accuse Allah of injustice. This is why Allah Taʿālā said:

لِيَبْلُوَكُمْ اَيُّكُمْ اَحْسَنُ عَمَلًا

To test which amongst you carry out the best deeds.

وَ لَنَبْلُوَنَّكُمْ حَتّٰى نَعْلَمَ الْمُجٰهِدِيْنَ مِنْكُمْ وَ الصّٰبِرِيْنَ وَ نَبْلُوَاْ اَخْبَارَكُمْ ﴿٣١﴾

We shall certainly test you until We ascertain those of you who strive and those who are steadfast and until We examine your condition.[2]

The summary of all of this is that if you have any misconceptions against us and think that Allah Taʿālā does not know who is good or who is bad, which is the reason why he tests man, then it would mean that Allah Taʿālā thought someone

1 Sūrah al-Aʿrāf: 172

2 Sūrah Muḥammad: 31

to be bad and as a result sent him to Jahannam, which is unjust. On the other hand, Allah knew already who is good and who is not, and tested us to make known to us who is good and who is bad, who is steadfast and who strives in the path of Allah. In summary, the purpose of this test is to present a clear proof to man and not so that Allah Taʿālā can gain knowledge.

The meaning of "Examine your condition"

In the second verse, "Examine your condition" is mentioned, which also calls out loudly that Allah Taʿālā was not unaware of the conditions of man and knew the conditions of the pious and evil from before time because in this case the meaning of this verse will be: the reality of your actions which is known to us and which you doubt, we will examine that as well. This makes it clear that Allah Taʿālā already had knowledge of everything before hand and it is not as the Imāmiyyah claim that Allah Taʿālā only learns of the nature of a thing after creating it, the reference of Nizām al-dīn al-Jilānī has already been mentioned above, but rather this entire system has been put into place to present a clear proof to man, just as with the angels. The reality is that just as Allah Taʿālā knew from before that Nabī Ādam عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ is more worthy of khilāfah and the angels do not possess the same qualities, so too was Allah Taʿālā aware from before time of who is deserving of Jannah and who is deserving of Jahannam. Just as we know that wood is meant for burning and bread is meant for eating, if Allah Taʿālā knew who is meant for Jahannam and who is meant for Jannah, there is no injustice at all. However, man is not the same as the angels, their nature is more defiant; this is why this entire system and examination has been put into place.

By the grace of Allah, the misconception which the Shīʿah scholars have fallen into, on account of the verse cited above, has been lifted and the correct meaning of the verse has become known. One should not be hasty and rush to the first interpretation that comes to mind when reciting a verse but it needs to be understood in light of other verses of the Qur'ān. If this is the Shīʿī way of interpretation then it is quite possible that tomorrow they will say regarding the following verses:

وَنَادى أَصْحَابَ الْجَنَّةِ

The residents of Jannah called out.

وَنَادى أَصْحَابَ الْأَعْرَافِ

Those residing on Aʿrāf called out.

وَنَادى أَصْحَابَ النَّارِ

The dwellers of the fire called out.

And other verses of this nature, that they refer to incidents which have already transpired because putting aside the verses and ahādīth which indicate that Qiyāmah is still going to take place, this verse informs us that it has already taken place because the past tense verb has been used in it. Little do they know that when something is still going to happen but its occurrence is certain then in common language it is said that it had happened. When judgement is passed for execution then people say he is dead (even though he is still going to be executed).

Even if the meaning of these verses might not appear to be the same as the other verses, even the most novice Arabic student will conclude that the people of Jannah could not have called upon the people of Jahannam as no one has entered Jannah or Jahannam as yet. Instead these events are still going to transpire on the Day of Qiyāmah. The preceding and following verses also attest to the same and the Imāmiyyah also say the same. Therefore just as these words, due to other evidence, has an alternate meaning other than the apparent (i.e. it has not occurred and is still going to transpire) so too there is no harm in taking the verse: “We shall certainly test you”, which indicates the future tense, on account of those verses which prove the infinite knowledge of Allah of everything before its creation, to refer to the past.

If you seek to verify the alternate meaning then listen well. Just as when something that is still going to transpire is certain and its occurrence incumbent,

it may be referred to in the past tense, so too can something which has occurred, but its reality, occurrence and existence to an extent hidden, be referred to in the future tense on account of the reality of its occurrence and non-occurrence only becoming known later. If an example is required then listen closely, when a person is severely ill and then is suddenly cured, it is obvious that his strength will not return as soon as he is cured but he will gain his strength slowly. If some of his creditors were to now come and ask their right from him, then the patient, if he has no wealth, will say that he will pay the debt as soon as he is better, even though he has been informed that he is cured of his illness.

Or assume that the sick person was not made aware that he has been cured; many a time a doctor can tell by the signs that he has been cured, yet he will tell the patient that he may pay him after he is cured. Thus, because the signs of the patient being cured have still not become apparent, i.e. he has not gained his strength, both the patient and the doctor use the future tense when referring to the cure of the illness; as if he has not been cured.

In the same way, Allah Taʿālā in His eternal knowledge knew full-well that the Ṣaḥābah were mujāhidīn and would be patient in adversity and the enemies of the Ṣaḥābah would be evil doers. The Ṣaḥābah on account of the fortune destined for them from before and their noble demeanour were worthy of being entrusted with a noble work and bestowed with qualities of perfection. The enemies of the Ṣaḥābah on the other hand because of the misfortune destined for them from before and their depraved character, were capable of only carrying out shameful deeds, on account of which their hearts will be blackened. However, this could not become evident, despite Allah's knowledge of it, until the laws of Sharīʿah were established and the deeds they were meant to perform were not carried out by their own hands yet you will find many unfortunate individuals still doubting this knowledge of Allah, just as the ill doubt the word of the doctor (that he has been cured) because of his usage of the future tense.

A common example of eternal fortune and eternal misfortune

As for the fortune and misfortune of man being decreed from eternity and being an inherent quality and not something that is attained or temporary, this is an intricate matter but to those of understanding this difference is the same as the difference between the intelligent and the foolish, the compassionate and the harsh, the generous and the miserly, the brave and the cowardly, the knowledgeable and the ignorant. Just as a wise king will take scholarly duties from the knowledgeable and not from the ignorant, so too does Allah Taʿālā take from man according to his capability.

All times (i.e. past, present and future) exist collectively

The reality is that time, from eternity until the infinite, exists as one; the past has not gone and the future is not absent. The reason for this is that if a person says: “Zaid is standing” then by listening to this statement everyone understands that Zaid exists and that this is his condition (i.e. he is standing). It is obvious that anything can only be in a particular state if it first exists. Once this has been understood then I wish to add that all those occurrences meant to happen on the Day of Qiyāmah, regarding which Allah Taʿālā says, and all know that Allah Taʿālā is Truthful:

إِنَّ السَّاعَةَ اٰتِيَةٌ

Qiyāmah is coming.[1]

Or as is said in another verse:

إِنَّ زَلْزَلَةَ السَّاعَةِ شَيْءٌ عَظِيْمٌ ۝١

Indeed the shaking of the Hour is a grave matter.[2]

In accordance with the rule mentioned above, we also understand that Qiyāmah exists and its condition is such that it is coming towards us and it is a grave

1 Sūrah Ṭāhā: 15

2 Sūrah al-Ḥijr: 1

matter. We believe in it without need for repetition nor do we make excuses or arguments (against it). If some mullah were to argue that there are many things whose qualities are mentioned but do not exist, for example: if a person were to say that a certain person has died or a certain thing does not exist (then even though the quality has been mentioned, they still do not exist), then, firstly, such an objection does not warrant a reply. However, if we were to reply then it should be understood that this statement is not describing a quality but rather stating the lack of any quality. On the contrary, when a person states that a certain person is standing or a certain thing is coming; it leaves no doubt as to its existence and establishes that it is going to occur. Therefore, when these qualities prove the existence of a thing, why are we second guessing the existence of Qiyāmah? Once this has been established, I wish to add further that just as Qiyāmah has been proven to be coming and on account of this quality, its existence also established; matters of the past are still passing. In addition, when Qiyāmah, etc has been described to be already in motion then it means then one day it will reach us and then pass. Thus, saying that a certain person has left, which establishes his existence, is no different from saying that a certain person is coming. In this manner both angles, the future and the past, are the same and exist together.

All tenses are the same to Allah Taʿālā

As a result of the statement of Allah Taʿālā:

اَلَآ اِنَّهٗ بِكُلِّ شَيْءٍ مُّحِيْطٌ ﴿٥٤﴾

> Verily He (Allah) encompasses everything.[1]

every tense (past, present and future) is encompassed by Allah. Thus, whichever meaning one might take for Allah Taʿālā encompassing everything, at the least this much is incumbent; that the knowledge of Allah encompasses everything. The following verse testifies to this precise meaning:

1 Sūrah Ḥā Mīm Sajdah: 54

اَنَّ اللّٰهَ قَدْ اَحَاطَ بِكُلِّ شَيْءٍ عِلْمًا ﴿١٢﴾

Allah’s knowledge encompasses all things.[1]

In this case, all the things that exist in the past and in future are the same to Allah, despite the difference that might exist between them. The future exists but when the future passes then it becomes of the past.

Understand Allah’s knowledge of the future and past from the following example: A person stands in the middle of a river, whatever is in the water on all four sides is in his view and seen as one, even though some of it is still coming towards him and some has already flowed past.

The past and future is all the present to Allah

In essence, all aspects of time and whatever happens, all of it is within the sight of Allah and seen by Him as one and when this is the case then all time becomes the present. However, in relation to each other they precede and follow, and the difference between past, present and future is between each other. Just as a person who stands in one place, in relation to him what lies before him will be called the front and what lies behind him will be called the back, whatever occurs in a specific time, it will be called the past when compared to the following hour, the future when compared to the hour before it and the present when the precise hour it occurred in is considered. Thus all of these times are the same before Allah Taʿālā in existence, but in relation to each other they are divided into past, present and future.

he usage of past, present and future tenses in the Qur’ān

At times Allah speaks in accordance to how matters appear to Him (without any difference in time) and at times He speaks taking into account the relation it has with time. In the first instance (when Allah speaks in accordance to how matters

1 Sūrah al-Ṭalāq: 12

appear to him), He will always use the past or the present tense, whereas in the second case if the matter happened in the past, He uses the past tense, if it is the present, He uses the present tense and if it still to happen then the future tense is used.

The reason Allah also uses the past tense and not only the present tense, even though all tenses are the same to Him, is because Allah Taʿālā wishes to either inform one of the occurrence of a matter or the continuation of it. Thus, the matter which Allah Taʿālā informs one of; if it is to inform of its continuation, then on account of it continuing and the manner in which Allah sees things, it will always be the present. Whereas if it is to inform one of the occurrence of a matter then the time when it is given will not remain the present but become the past (so the past tense is used), since occurrences are momentary not perpetual. Accordingly, if one is being informed of something that is still going to happen, it should be in the future tense. Thus, information of an occurrence cannot be in the present tense, it will either be in the past tense or the future tense. If anyone is informed of the occurrence of a matter before it occurs then he will inform others of it in the future tense and after it occurs and he witnesses it, he will inform others in the past tense. He will only be able to use the present tense if the occurrence continues. However, everything in the knowledge of Allah Taʿālā is the present, so wherever he informs others of something that is still going to occur in the past tense, such as:

> The residents of Jannah called out.

He does so because everything is the present to Him (and Allah Taʿālā has already seen what is going to happen) and wherever He makes mention of matters which already occurred in the future tense, such as:

> Until We ascertain those of you who strive.

He does so because that event in relation to what is before it, is the future (and is not in accordance with how it appears to Him).

The universe is not eternal because it does not continue

May the level-headed gauge this discussion fairly and then admit that this unworthy one, even though insignificant, speaks the truth. Let it not be that on account of your misunderstanding, you accuse the author of believing the universe to be eternal. It is for this reason that I wish to state beforehand that for anything to be eternal, it is necessary that it must exist continuously, i.e. it must exist long before time and long after time. It must not be proven to exist in a fixed period as then it will be temporary and not eternal.

Two ways of attaining knowledge: Through means and without means

If someone finds this discussion to be too confusing and finds it difficult to understand its meaning then there is a second method by which we are able to conclude that Allah’s knowledge is eternal and encompasses everything, which will also explain the meaning of the verses quoted in the preceding pages.

When we explore the knowledge we have, we learn that knowledge of things is acquired in two ways:

1. Without means
2. With means, which can be either lāzim (incumbent) or malzūm (necessitated).

A person can learn whether the sun has risen or if there is sunshine without means, by seeing it with his own eyes, or learn of it with means, that is when seeing the sunshine he learns that the sun has risen or when he sees the sun, he knows there is sunshine. For example, if a person is sitting in his home where he cannot see the sun but sees the sunshine then by means of the sunshine he learns that the sun has risen. This knowledge of the sun rising he has gained with means which is *lāzim* (incumbent). However, if he sees the sun directly while sitting in the courtyard of his home and determines that there is sunshine then this knowledge (of the sunshine) he has gained with means that is *malzūm* (necessitated). In a similar manner, consider fire and smoke. At times knowledge

of this is learnt without means, when looking at the fire or smoke with the naked eye, and at times with means, when he sees smoke from behind the wall and knows that there is a fire or sees the fire of a lamp from afar and knows that there must be smoke.

Generally knowledge of only one is learnt with means and without means both occur

Generally when something is learnt without means it necessitates learning it with means as well, which occurs simultaneously with no precedence given to either. For example, a person sees a fire up close and obviously sees its smoke as well, so in this case knowledge of the fire has been learnt from two ways; without means- because he saw it with his naked eye, and with means- because seeing the smoke informs him there is a fire. Therefore, even though a person sees the fire, he still determines from the smoke that it is a fire. What shortcoming has befallen the smoke on account of him seeing the fire that it will no longer indicate that a fire is burning?

Sometimes knowledge acquired with means is concealed because of the knowledge acquired without means

If one were to ponder deeply then he would conclude that the knowledge acquired with means is sometimes concealed by the knowledge acquired without means to such an extent that he does not even perceive it. When he saw the fire and saw the smoke, the knowledge of the fire which he learnt by seeing it directly conceals the knowledge of the fire he gained by seeing the smoke. This is an example of how in the day the stars still shine but they are eclipsed by the radiant rays of the sun, such that their presence is not even perceived.

Sometimes knowledge of two things is acquired without means or one with means and the other without means

Once this has been thoroughly understood that one thing may be learnt without means and with means at the same time, then also keep in mind that two things

can also be learnt without means. For example, one sees the fire and the smoke at the same time. In a similar manner, when it is clear that a thing might be known directly or by means of something and sometimes it is known by both means, we also need to know that two things can become known simultaneously without means, for example; one sees fire and smoke at the same time. In a similar fashion, one can be learnt without means and the other with means, both at the same time, for example learning of the fire without means (by seeing it) and of the smoke with means (of the fire) or learning of the smoke without means (by seeing it) and of the fire with means (of the smoke). Knowledge of the fire is gained instantaneously such that it is never said that I learnt of this at this time and of the other at another time.

There is no precedence in the Knowledge which Allah gains without means and with means

Rationally one might understand there to be a sequence of one occurring before the other, knowledge acquired without means occurring before that with means. In other words a person will regard the knowledge of the latter to be dependent upon the knowledge of the first. Such as when a person shakes something in his hand, even though they move simultaneously, he will say that the hand moves first then what is in his hand. Therefore in this instance, even though the knowledge of both occurs simultaneously, the knowledge attained without means is said to precede that which occurs with means and just as a person can say that he shook his hand in order to shake what was in his hand, so too it can be said that he looked at the sunshine to gain knowledge of the sun.

The knowledge of Allah gained without means is mentioned in the past and present tense in the Qur’ān and that gained with means is mentioned in the future tense

After having understood this introductory lesson, I wish to state that mentioning:

وَ لَنَبْلُوَنَّكُمْ حَتّٰى نَعْلَمَ الْمُجٰهِدِيْنَ مِنْكُمْ وَ الصّٰبِرِيْنَ وَ نَبْلُوَاْ اَخْبَارَكُمْ

> We shall certainly test you until We ascertain those of you who strive and those who are steadfast and until We examine your condition.[1]

in the future tense will not affect the claim that Allah Taʿālā's knowledge is eternal in the least because Allah Taʿālā has knowledge of everything from two means, without means and with means simultaneously. The reason being that everything has a sign and just as the *lāzim* (incumbent) and *malzūm* (necessitated) can be learnt without means, so too can they be learnt by means of each other. In addition, both of these have existed with each other since eternity, even though that learnt with means becomes concealed by that learnt without means. In this manner as well, Allah Taʿālā has knowledge of everything with means at the same time that he has knowledge of it without means from eternity, but since that which is learnt without means is given precedence over that which is learnt with means (knowledge acquired without means regarded to have come first and knowledge with means second), wherever the knowledge of Allah Taʿālā is mentioned in the future tense, it refers to the knowledge He has with means, as there is no difference in time to Him, and wherever He has used the past or present tense it refers to the knowledge He has without means.

Since the knowledge of man is all with means, they were addressed in the future tense

Since Allah Taʿālā was addressing man in the Qur'ān, and man - in fact all creatures of intellect - attain their knowledge with means and not without, Allah Taʿālā addressed them in the future tense. The salient qualities of the soul or of man such as generosity, bravery, compassion, etc if they exist, they exist within in the heart and are not perceived by the eye or any of the five senses. If the existence of these qualities are learnt then it is learnt by its effects. Generosity is learnt by giving, which is the action of the hand, bravery is learnt by his courage in battle, which is the action of the hands and legs, compassion is learnt from the kind

1 Sūrah Muḥammad: 31

words one speaks, which is the action of the tongue, and in a similar manner the presence of the soul is determined by movement, which are all actions of the body.

If Allah were to have spoken through His knowledge without means then it would not serve as proof against them

Wherever Allah Taʿālā has used the future tense then it is in matters which cannot be learnt by man without means (thus the future tense was used to indicate that they will learn of this in the future). If Allah Taʿālā were to have spoken to man in relation to His knowledge without means then it would not serve as proof against man. This is why wherever Allah Taʿālā referred to a matter that would serve as a proof against man, Allah Taʿālā used the future tense in relation to the knowledge they would learn with means. Wherever this was not the purpose, Allah spoke in relation to His knowledge without means, using the present or past tense. However since man cannot gain knowledge of these matters without means and before it occurs, it is impossible for them to know of it, they gauged the knowledge of Allah in relation to their own and understood Allah’s usage of the future tense to mean that this knowledge is still to be gained (by Allah). Thus, they are left confused, since Allah Taʿālā says:

اَنَّ اللّٰهَ قَدْ اَحَاطَ بِكُلِّ شَیْءٍ عِلْمًا

> Allah’s knowledge encompasses all things.[1]

which indicates that Allah Taʿālā has complete knowledge of everything since eternity, while other verses indicate that knowledge of certain things are gained later such as:

وَ لَنَبْلُوَنَّكُمْ حَتّٰى نَعْلَمَ الْمُجٰهِدِيْنَ مِنْكُمْ وَ الصّٰبِرِيْنَ وَ نَبْلُوَاْ اَخْبَارَكُمْ

> We shall certainly test you until We ascertain those of you who strive and those who are steadfast and until We examine your condition.[2]

1 Sūrah al-Ṭalāq: 12

2 Sūrah Muḥammad: 31

However, those of understanding and those acquainted with the point mentioned above know that the knowledge referred to in both instances is the same to Allah.

The concepts of *maḥw* (erasing) and *ithbāt* (confirmation) in the two Divine records

It would only be appropriate at this juncture, to mention the explanation of the verse:

يَمْحُوا اللّٰهُ مَا يَشَآءُ وَيُثْبِتُ

> Allah erases whatever He wills and keeps in place(whatever He wills).[1]

A discussion for which objective Shīʿī scholars might have been waiting in anticipation. Let us first view the verse in its entirety, thereafter my own thoughts will also be set forth. The entire verse runs as follows:

وَمَا كَانَ لِرَسُوْلٍ اَنْ يَّاْتِيَ بِاٰيَةٍ اِلَّا بِاِذْنِ اللّٰهِ ۗ لِكُلِّ اَجَلٍ كِتَابٌ ﴿۳۸﴾ يَمْحُوا اللّٰهُ مَا يَشَآءُ وَيُثْبِتُ ۖ وَعِنْدَهٗٓ اُمُّ الْكِتٰبِ ﴿۳۹﴾

> A rasūl is not capable of producing a sign without Allah's order. Every period has written commands. Allah erases whatever He wills and keeps in place (whatever He wills) and with Him is the Mother (Original) of Books.[2]

The essence of this verse is that no rasūl can produce a miracle as a sign of his nubuwwah except with divine sanction. For every period there are separate written commands of which He erases whatever He wishes, and retains what He wants. While with Him there exists another greater set of written commands which is the source of all.

1 Sūrah al-Raʿd: 39

2 Sūrah al-Raʿd: 38, 39

That much is the purport of the verse. After duly noting that there is reference to two separate written commands; one for every period and a source in Allah’s possession, and that erasing and confirmation are mentioned in relation to the first only, men of understanding would realize:

- There are two distinct Divine records- the greater record, referred to as *Umm al-Kitāb* and the lesser record to which the phrase: “Every period has written commands” refers to.
- The acts of erasing and confirmation apply exclusively to the lesser record and not to the greater one.

This is precisely the position of the Ahl al-Sunnah. They too believe that there can be no addition to or deduction from the greater record, which is either in accordance with Allah’s Knowledge, or is itself His Knowledge.

Badā’ is justifiable from the Qur’ān only in the same manner that the prohibition of ṣalāh may be proven from the verse: “Do not approach ṣalāh...”

On which fine aspect do the Shīʿah then raise the claim that badā’ is justified in the Qur’ān? If it is from this verse that they substantiate their claim, then it would be no different from the fool who claimed that he does not pray ṣalāh because Allah forbids ṣalāh in the Qur’ān. Someone asked him: “Sir, show us this too. We have never heard this. If this is indeed the case then there would be great ease.” The fool replied: “Is it not mentioned in Sūrah al-Nisā’: “Do not come close to prayer.” He was then told: “But the verse goes on to say: “...when you are intoxicated.” The verse must be practiced in its entirety.” The fool in turn replied: “Hey! who has ever practiced on the whole text? It is already a lot just to practice just this much!”... So perhaps the scholars of the Shīʿah invoke a similar rule here.

On a lighter note, there may be a different excuse for the Shīʿah. It might just be that they only knew the verse up to the point where it says: “Every period has

written commands; He erases what He wills and keeps in place (what He wills).” It was then by their total submission and complete adherence that they were led to this belief. As such, it would actually be praiseworthy. But if they knew the part of the verse which says: “And with Him is the Mother (original) of Books”, and still they held a belief different from that of the Ahl al-Sunnah, it would be worthy of condemnation.

Allah is indeed Pure! All these claims of competing with the Ahl al-Sunnah in understanding the Qur’ān and on the Qur’ān being preserved but:

موشي بخواب اندر بيرون زشهر شود

In a dream it seems wonderful but the reality is quite different

Most arguments of the Shīʿah belong to the same genre as that of the fool. The manner in which they recall verses from the Qur’ān is no different from that depicted in a couplet wherein the poet Mirza Noshā describes the effect of sectarian affiliation:

لا تقربوا الصلاة زنهيم بخاطر است   وز امر ياد ماند كلوا واشربوا مرا

The order do not approach salāh appeals to the heart

And the order to eat and drink is all that is acted upon

Divine knowledge is pre-eternal, immutable and all encompassing

The truth is that divine knowledge does not undergo any change. How could there be when the very thought is dispelled by Allah every step of the way in words such as:

وَكَانَ اللّٰهُ عَلِيْمًا حَكِيْمًا

Allah is All Knowing, The Wise.[1]

1 Sūrah al-Nisā’: 111

وَ كَانَ اللّٰهُ بِكُلِّ شَیْءٍ عَلِیْمًا

Allah has knowledge of all things.[1]

وَكُنَّا بِكُلِّ شَیْءٍ عٰلِمِیْنَ

We have knowledge of all things.[2]

وَّ اَنَّ اللّٰهَ قَدْ اَحَاطَ بِكُلِّ شَیْءٍ عِلْمًا

And that Allah’s knowledge encompasses everything.[3]

وَكَانَ اللّٰهُ بِكُلِّ شَیْءٍ مُّحِیْطًا

Allah surrounds (has knowledge of and is in control of) everything.[4]

The Knowledge of Allah encompasses all things pre-eternally. The only way in which a mistake could be perceived to occur is for something to come between Allah and what He knows. Were such an idea even to arise, it would be refuted by several verses of the Qur’ān, where Allah describes Himself as “اقرب” (closest).

Should the Shīʿah suggest that (Allah forbid) there could be interruption of Allah’s capabilities then such brazenness could only ever be mustered by the Shīʿah. That aside, it is a verse of the Qur’ān and not the mutterings of some priest; Allah says:

اِنَّ اللّٰهَ لَا یَخْفٰی عَلَیْهِ شَیْءٌ فِی الْاَرْضِ وَلَا فِی السَّمَآءِ

Definitely nothing in the heavens or the earth is hidden from Allah.

1 Sūrah al-Aḥzāb: 40

2 Sūrah al-Ambiyā’: 81

3 Sūrah al-Ṭalāq: 12

4 Sūrah al-Nisā’: 126

Badā' ascribes compound ignorance to Allah

Despite the fact that the scholars of the Shīʿah generally possess some command of the rational disciplines, they do not seem to understand that incorrect knowledge is not really knowledge, but rather a form of ignorance that is referred to as 'Compound Ignorance' (Jahl Murakkab). This technical term is known even to the illiterate, let alone students of the advanced texts in logic. It is in fact a very common saying that simple ignorance (Jahl Baṣīṭ) is better than compound ignorance (Jahl Murakkab). Be that as it may, the charge of compound ignorance directed by these people against the Most Sacred and Sublime Being is such that in the first place it amounts to the effective abrogation of the previously mentioned verses. Allah is indeed Pure! A mere human abrogating the words of Allah and then too in a matter of belief, which by consensus of the Ahl al-Sunnah and the Shīʿah, and the ummah at large for that matter, lies beyond the reach of abrogation. Secondly, between Allah Most High and compound ignorance there exists simply no relation. Absolved is Allah from all such fallacious attributions.

Badā' gives all entities in existence a degree of superiority over Allah

Thirdly, inanimate objects which do not have any knowledge, and all entities in existence for that matter, become in one sense superior to Allah. That is because all things besides Allah suffer some degree of simple ignorance while there is no simple ignorance with Allah. The verses cited made it clear that Allah has knowledge of all things. If that knowledge now turns out to be incorrect, it results in a case of compound ignorance, compared to which simple ignorance is better. In this case, all things in existence gain a degree of superiority over Allah. Allah is indeed Pure! What a way to recognize the greatness of Allah!

The entire world is the divine record of erasing and confirmation

The question may now be asked as to which is that record wherein erasing and confirmation occurs. Since it is already known to us that it is something other than the Knowledge of Allah, there is no real need to answer this question. However, since there is certainly merit in setting the mind at ease, we submit

that the reality of these things is known only to Allah and those whom Allah grants knowledge thereof. It thus devolves upon us to proffer a possible and conceivable explanation. What this unworthy writer has come to understand from the discussions of the learned elders is that the entire world is the divine record in which some things may be conceived of as the paper and others can be understood as the symbols and letters.

An example to explain erasure and confirmation

To further understand this, here is one example. Wax or any similar pliable substance can be shaped into any form- round or elongated - but at any one given time that wax can assume only one particular shape; it cannot have two forms simultaneously. The first shape will cease to exist when the second shape takes form. However, since forms are a type of engraving, they may be understood as letters and symbols, with the wax itself being the paper.

Once this example has settled into the mind, then understand further. The metamorphosis of shapes and states appears in all physical entities. The crop that grows forth from the earth is constituted of parts of that same earth. Under divine care it changes from its first shape. The crop then undergoes several changes until it assumes the form of food. In reality, this food is that same original earth that has now come into the form of food. It goes into the stomach and becomes something else, and passing through the stage of semen it turns into something different altogether. In the same way, look at all other physical substances. Heat and cold, and all other changes are part of the same phenomenon. The soul too, undergoes the same type of change in condition; sadness, happiness, fear and safety.

Thus, those things that undergo these constant changes may be understood to be the letters and symbols of the divine record, while the physical substances and non-physical souls, which like the wax, remain present constantly throughout the processes of change, are the pages of that record. Understand now that those shapes that have given way to other shapes have been erased as such, while the

new shapes which have taken the place of the old ones have been confirmed. Those acquainted with Arabic and Persian would recognize that the word "*Ithbāt*" (confirmation) is commonly used to denote the act of writing.

Amazing explanation of "Every period has written commands"

Since every shape requires a certain time limit within which to subsist, Allah says: "Every period has written commands." This means that every length of time has its own distinct inscription. When that length of time expires and the time arrives for other inscriptions, other shapes and states take their place and the earlier shapes are obliterated, and the inscriptions for the new period are written onto the pages. The pages, however, are not such that they are polluted or contaminated by the erasure of earlier shapes. Rather, just as one erases what he had written earlier in a book or on a slate or wooden board, and writes something else in its place, in the same way Allah inscribes onto these pages what He wishes and then erases it in accordance to His Will.

The Umm al-Kitāb explained through an example

The copies, or rather, prototypes of all former and latter shapes are contained within a larger book. The student learning geometric shapes draws each shape on his slate, and when the time comes to learn a new shape, he erases the old one and inscribes the new shape onto his slate. The prototypes of all these shapes however, are preserved in the text books of Geometry.

Accordingly, the manner in which this verse connects coherently with what precedes it is as follows:

> How can a prophet produce a miracle of his own accord? With Us there are fixed and determined inscriptions for every period that cannot be increased or decreased. Thus, no one can - by his own whim - bring about a miraculous sign.

Badā’ is untenable since there is no erasure in Allah’s knowledge

The fair-minded should duly note the coherence of this discussion. All said and done, there remains no space within which to accommodate badā’, so those who advocate this belief are left at a loss to substantiate their claims. It is therefore untenable to say that since the verse contains mention of erasure and confirmation, there must be erasure and confirmation within Allah’s knowledge.

Another example to explain the Umm al-Kitāb, erasure and confirmation

However, minds tend to rush towards such ideas firmly entrenched within them. To a hungry person, two plus two will always be not just four but four loaves of bread. It is thus not inconceivable for the above discussion to be countered with the contention that it is commonly known that the writing which this verse mentions is the act usually perceived to be scripting. It applies therefore to those symbols and letters which represent words or speech. The reply to this, in the first place, is that being commonly known is by no means a criterion of

correctness. Such an argument can only be raised against an inconsistent and unsuitable claim.

However, in spite of that, we will also venture down this road. Most people would have seen that shopkeepers keep a record of their daily business on a slate, and that they later transfer that record to a ledger and wash the slate clean. Thereafter they write the takings of the next day on that same slate. Thus writing and erasing takes place on a daily basis, while all of it is recorded in the ledger, which is never erased. In a similar manner should the infinite knowledge of Allah be understood. The daily actions are recorded on a slate, the entire generation upon that one slate, after which it is transcribed to the main ledger, which is called the Umm al-Kitāb. Thereafter, the actions of a new generation are recorded on that slate and later transcribed to the ledger. For example, the actions of those living in the era of Rasūlullāh ﷺ are recorded on the slate and then at the end of this era transcribed to the ledger or Umm al-Kitāb. Thereafter the slate is

wiped clean and the actions of those living in the next generation of the Ṣaḥābah are recorded and then transcribed to the ledger once that era has ended. In this manner, erasing and confirmation continues through the ages but it is obvious to all that this erasure is not on account of any error, which may prove the concept of badā'.

If we accept that maḥw wa ithbāt refers to the erasure and confirmation in *ahkām* (laws), then too this is a sign of intelligence, and in no way does it constitute badā'

If we momentarily - for arguments sake - accept that what we have just explained is not the case, rather this erasure and confirmation is due to the changes in the *aḥkām* (laws), then too the claim of the Shī̒ah cannot be proven.

Let us take an example: A sick person goes to the doctor who, according to the medical books and journals, prescribes a certain type of medication for him. After a while, the doctor alters his medication, he reduces some and adds others. After some time again he puts the patient onto some other treatment.

This was all done according to the medical laws and protocols found in the medical books, since the doctor understood that after the first round of treatment has taken effect, the patient will need to clear his system of the remains of that medications, therefore the second prescription was prescribed, then he will need to now make up for the loss of energy and strengthen the body and therefore the third type of medications, etc, are required.

This change in prescription was not because the doctor erred the first time and now needed to correct his mistake. In fact, this shows the deep understanding, intelligence and expertise of the doctor, that each medication was prescribed, according to the medical laws and rules documented in the medical books or journals, on its appropriate time.

If you have understood this, then in the same light understand the system of the creation of Allāh.

For the sake of understanding this example, think of the Creator, Allāh Taʿālā who is Most Wise, as the experienced, expert doctor. Picture the Umm al-kitāb as the medical books and journals, picture “لِكُلِّ اَجَلٍ كِتَابٌ” (Every period has written commands), which is in the Umm al-kitāb, as the various different prescriptions, picture the angels as the nurses and those taking care and administering the medication to the sick, and finally picture the entire world as the patient.

Understand the maḥw wa ithbāt as the various different prescriptions and medications.

Now if these changes are understood to be badā’, as explained by the Shīʿah, then this is the height of foolishness.

Yes, if the change in prescription was because initially the doctor prescribed some medication which he later realized is not having an effect, and changed the medication due to his earlier error, then this could be classified as badā’.

However, this scenario is not possible here, since the second portion of the verse states: “Every period has written commands”, which means that in every time and era there are a different set of laws, and the change therefore is because of the change in time and era, not because of an earlier mistake.

In short, the three explanations given above are interwoven and interlinked, and after understanding and pondering over it, none of the proponents of badā’ will have the courage to even think of, let alone present this verse in support of their doctrine of badā’.

However, many a time we find that there is no benefit in putting the truth before a person whose heart is bereft of justice. Anyhow, those who understood have understood, and those who have not understood, may Allah grant them the understanding.

The third proof presented by the Shīʿah in support of the concept of badā’

Some Shīʿah scholars have presented a new proof to support their concept of badā’. They attempt to prove this concept it by presenting the verse:

وَ وٰعَدْنَا مُوْسٰى ثَلٰثِيْنَ لَيْلَةً وَّ اَتْمَمْنٰهَا بِعَشْرٍ فَتَمَّ مِيْقَاتُ رَبِّهٖۤ اَرْبَعِيْنَ لَيْلَةً

We will now analyse this assertion. First, understand the meaning of this verse:

> We promised Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام thirty nights and we completed the duration by adding ten nights, so the duration of his Rabb, forty nights, was completed.

Now we will examine the conclusion the Shīʿah from this verse. They assert:

> Allah first promised to reveal the Torah after thirty nights of effort, but after thirty nights had passed the Torah was still not given. Instead he was instructed to add another ten nights. The only reason that comes to mind is that after thirty nights of solitude had passed, Allah found it inappropriate that such a great recompense or award (i.e. the Torah) be given in lieu of such a short period, so the duration was increased to emphasise the greatness of the award going to be given.
>
> So if we say that Allah Taʿālā was not aware of this from before, then this is badā’, as explained by the earlier Shīʿī scholars, otherwise, at the least we can say is that Allah Taʿālā knew of it, but he promised Nabī Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام and the Banū Isrā’īl something else.
>
> Although there is a large difference between these two possibilities mentioned above, according to us there is no difference between badā’ as per the explanation of the earlier Shīʿī scholars and the *towriyah* (insinuation) of Allah.
>
> So in conclusion, we cannot trust and rely on the word of Allah. Therefore, if we find praises for the Ṣaḥābah or any of the beliefs of the Ahl al-Sunnah in the Qur’ān, it matters not. We cannot rely on it.

(Here ends the proof of the Shīʿah.)

Answer 1

One needs to first understand that there is a major difference between the mistake made by the speaker and the misunderstanding of the listener. The Shīʿah ascribe their misunderstanding to Allah and conclude that Allah Taʿālā made a mistake (Allah forbid). What they do not realise is that their misunderstanding is a fault on their part, not a fault on the part of Allah.

Everyone is aware that this incident has been mentioned here in brief. No mention is made here about fasting and of the miswāk, but we find mention of it in the books of ḥadīth and tafsīr; where it explains that it was not a mere matter of spending thirty or forty days, but it was actually to fast for this duration. In a similar manner, it is possible that there were some other conditions attached which have not been mentioned, such as to use the miswāk.

Even if we do assume that from other narrations it is proven that the ‘payment’ for the Torah was only thirty days of fasting, without any other condition attached to it, then not considering that it is impossible to prove, because the most that can be said is that there is no mention of any other condition (referred to as *ʿAdm al-Thubūt*), but to prove that there was no other condition (*Thubūt al-ʿAdm*) is impossible.

First example

The explanation of the above is as follows, there are many conditions which are not explicitly mentioned at the time of stipulating the payment or wages, but are understood to be there.

For example, a person working for the court or in the army. It is not mentioned at the time of stipulating the wages, etc, that he will have to wear a certain uniform, obey all the rules of the court or army, but at the same time, if he leaves out any of these things, he will be reprimanded, fined or even punished.

If someone says that you cannot make an analogy on those working for the king, because there is no mention made of the work to be done nor of the remuneration

he will receive. Only one thing is mentioned which everyone knows (i.e. service to the king), as for other matters like the uniform etc, that is also understood. So although nothing has been mentioned, everything forms part of the original agreement.

Our answer to this is that this actually proves our point. You mentioned that everything has not been mentioned, but due to it being understood as a condition, it still forms part of the agreement. Thus, this will be more so when only a few things need to be understood. In this case there is no need to clearly spell each condition out, and still it will form part of the agreement.

Second example

If you are not satisfied with this example, then here is another example.

You hire a horse to go somewhere. At the time of the agreement there is no mention of the reigns, saddle, fodder, etc, but if the owner of the horse gives you a horse without the above mentioned things, you will argue with him for not giving you what is due to you.

Similarly understand that if between Allah Taʿālā and his special slaves, more so the ambiyā’, there are certain rules and guidelines pertaining to manners and etiquette, which are known and understood by these special servants. There will be some sort of action taken if these are left out, even though these are not clearly mentioned or spelled out it is still required.

However, this will not be termed as badā’. It could only be called badā’ if the ambiyā’ had no knowledge about it. If they were aware of it, and then due to human weakness they omitted some of it, then this can never be termed badā’.

Answer 2

The above explanation was based on us accepting what the Shīʿah said about adding another ten nights, that it was an increase in the ‘payment’. The reality of the matter is that only this much is mentioned in the verse:

> Allah promised to give Nabī Mūsā عَلَيۡهِ ٱلسَّلَامُ the Torah on completion of thirty days of sacrifice and effort.

Let us look at an example:

You hired a person to work for one month for a stipulated wage. This means that this stipulated wage will be given to him if he works for one month, whether you give him his wage on the thirtieth day or after that.

Similarly, the Torah was promised on completion of thirty days of sacrifice. This means that the fruits of thirty days of sacrifice will be the Torah, whether it will be given on the thirtieth day or thereafter is a separate matter.

Now the reason for why ten days of additional sacrifice and effort was taken from Nabī Musa عَلَيۡهِ ٱلسَّلَامُ is definitely not our responsibility to explain.

Dispelling a doubt

If someone of shallow understanding decides to use the word "أَتۡمَمۡنٰهَا" (We completed) to make the argument that we understand from this word that the ten extra days was a *tatimmah* (completion) and a part of the thirty, then we have an answer for him as well.

It is clearly mentioned in the aḥādīth that the sunnah and nafl ṣalāh are a *tatimmah* (completion) of the farḍ ṣalāh. Similarly, Ṣadaqah al-Fiṭr is a tatimmah of the fast of Ramaḍān. Yet no one draws the conclusion from here that the amount of farḍ ṣalāh has increased.

What it implies is that due to human weakness there is always some shortfall or shortcoming in every action, even though one tries ones level best to render. Thus the tatimmah is put into place to cover up for these shortfalls and shortcomings.

The original amount of the act still remains the same in the knowledge of Allah and according to us.

In a similar manner one should understand the ten extra days.

In fact, the word "اَتْمَمْنٰهَا" (We completed) itself indicates that this these ten days were to make up for any shortfalls, although the original promised amount was still thirty.

If the sacrifice and effort of these thirty days were from all angles accepted and there were no shortfalls (which arise due to human weakness, of which no person, not even a nabī or walī, saint, is free from) then there would not have been the directive to spend another ten days.

Another doubt which could arise, is that from the word "مِيْقَاتُ رَبِّهٖ" (the appointed time of his Rabb) some one could say that this indicates that the entire forty days was the actual period.

The answer to this is that there is a stipulated 'price' for every action, and for each 'price' there is a certain stipulated amount of effort. There are ample verses and aḥādīth which prove this point.

The stipulated 'price' for attaining such a great thing as the Torah was actually forty nights, but due to the generosity, favour and all-encompassing Mercy of Allah Taʿālā, He gave a concession to Nabī Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ and reduced it to thirty nights.

This is akin to how nine-tenths concession has been given to the general masses of this ummah, as is mentioned in this verse:

مَنْ جَآءَ بِالْحَسَنَةِ فَلَهٗ عَشْرُ اَمْثَالِهَا

Whoever does one good deed will be rewarded ten fold.

So, it will be said that he got the reward of ten good deeds in lieu of only one good deed, so there is a concession of nine-tenths of effort.

There are many other aḥādīth which indicate the same meaning, and there are also certain verses and aḥādīth which give even greater concession to certain individuals. Due to fear of lengthening this treatise, we will suffice with what has been said.

The gist of what has been discussed above is that initially, due to the favour of Allah Ta’ala, a concession of ten days was given to Nabī Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ, but then due to human weakness, this was not done to such a degree of perfection which was required to be given the Torah, rather there was some sort of shortfall, which was compensated for by the extra ten days.

So due to His infinite Grace and Mercy the entire thirty days of effort was not rejected due to the shortfall, although if Allah Ta’ala wished there was a valid reason to do so. Instead, Allah Taʿālā instructed another ten days be added so that Nabī Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ would be successful and achieve his objective. In this way he would not return empty handed and saddened to his people. Forty days were thus completed, and it was said: “فَتَمَّ مِيْقَاتُ رَبِّهٖٓ اَرْبَعِيْنَ لَيْلَةً” (so, the appointed time of his Rabb, forty nights, were thus completed)

In other words, the period which is normally demanded (before concession is given) to attain these special favours was eventually been completed.

Answer 3

Sometimes there are certain actions which carry no real importance in the court of Allah and no emphasis is laid upon it, but when a special servant of Allah, under certain circumstances, carries out that deed with such sincerity due to some need at that time then Allah Taʿālā accepts this action in such a way that it is now made part of other actions on account of the level of humility, submissiveness and servitude it was carry out with. Thereafter everyone is also commanded or asked to carry out this action.

Allah orders this to highlight his appreciation of that action and to expose the status of his servant to the world.

To further understand this, look at the example of Hājar رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهَا. Everyone knows the incident of how she ran between Safā and Marwā in search of water. This act of running between Safā and Marwā, in itself does not constitute an act of ibādah, but now it has been included in the sunan or wājibāt of ḥajj.

In the same token, the duration of forty nights was not something of importance in the sight of Allah, it was only the usual thirty nights which were given special virtue. But when Nabī Mūsā عَلَيْهِ ٱلسَّلَامُ carried out those forty nights of exertion and effort on that specific occasion, due to the need of the hour, then on account of the great level of sincerity; Allah Ta'ala accepted it in such a way that from that moment onwards, the period of forty days was stipulated as the period one has to complete to attain virtue.

When this specific number (forty) has now been awarded a special status in the court of Allah, then the verse: "فَتَمَّ مِيْقَاتُ رَبِّهٖٓ اَرْبَعِيْنَ لَيْلَةً" will mean that the normal duration to achieve these special favours was thirty; but since Nabī Mūsā عَلَيْهِ ٱلسَّلَامُ completed forty nights of exertion and effort with such a great deal of sincerity, Allah Ta'ala has now accepted this action due to his sincerity to such an extent that now the period of forty nights has been stipulated for gaining closeness to Allah Ta'ala.

The difference between this explanation and the one before it is quite apparent, so there is no need for further elaboration. However, we will render a conclusion to this lengthy discussion.

Conclusion: Badā' constitutes speaking lies

An unbiased person will come to the conclusion that badā' will only be proven from this verse in one of the following two instances:

1. Allah, who is the Knower of the unseen, promised to grant the Torah to Nabī Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ after thirty days, but had absolutely no idea of the forty nights at that time and only coincidently, due to some unforeseen reason, changed His former intention and instead of granting the Torah after thirty nights, bestowed it only after forty nights.

2. Allah, who is the Knower of the apparent and hidden, knew that the Torah will only be given after forty days, but He intentionally informed Nabī Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ that it will be given after thirty days. Nabī Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ was convinced that he will receive the Torah after thirty days, but Allah Taʿālā knew something else, and therefore he only received it after forty days.

In this second instance, although there is no defect in the knowledge and intention of Allah Taʿālā, it is not free from deceit.

This point had to be brought here, because some of the ‘research scholars’ of the Shīʿah try to explain badā’ in such a manner that there will be some defect in the *ikhbār* (informing), but no blemish or defect will be attached to the *ʿilm* (knowledge) and *irādah* (intention) of Allah.

Those who are aware of the grandeur and greatness of Allah Ta’ala, fully understand that not a single quality of Allah, whether it be ʿilm, irādah or any other quality for that matter; all are free from any type of defection or blemish.

The above mentioned ‘research scholar’ was pleased with himself when he chose this explanation. He thought that by doing so the Ahl al-Sunnah will not be able to object against him, since the ʿilm and irādah of Allah has been declared to be free from any defect or blemish, but the poor chap did not realise that by this explanation, another defect was ascribed to another quality of Allah.

Badā’ in the ʿilm of Allah does not arise due to the misunderstanding of the listener

Nevertheless, according to the explanation tendered by the Shīʿah, whichever of these two cases are assumed, it necessitates badā’.

However, if we assume another case, then there is no scope for establishing badā’ from this verse. That is we say that this was a work agreement. In other words on completion of a certain work, a stipulated remuneration would be awarded, and this comprised of the fulfilling of certain conditions, which if not fulfilled will result in the remuneration being withheld. Similarly, if the work is not up to the required standard then too the remuneration be withheld.

If this was the agreement, then the Torah not being given after thirty days but only after the period was extended, will not imply any mistake on the part of Allah, which could be translated as badā’.

Yes, no doubt, misunderstanding of the listener can take place, and even the Ambiya, who are *maʿsūm* (infallible), are not maʿsūm from misunderstandings. So if Nabī Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ misunderstood something then even though we (the Ahl al-Sunnah) will not say that this is his mistake, we will say that it has nothing to do with badā’.

If misunderstanding of the listener is taken to be badā’, then the Ahl al-Sunnah- who vehemently reject the concept of badā’, will be regarded as proponents of badā’, since this type of so-called badā’ is found in abundance according to the Ahl al-Sunnah.

The Ahl al-Sunnah regard the differences amongst the A’immah as a great blessing, and these differences are caused by one misunderstanding something, yet this is not termed badā’.

In short, badā’ means that the speaker (who in this case is Allah) himself misunderstands something, as per the belief of the earlier Shīʿah scholars, or

that the speaker intentionally says the incorrect thing, as per the interpretation of some of the ‘research scholars’ of our time. Badā’ in no way means that the listener, whether a nabī or an scholar or even anyone else misunderstands something. This is rather termed as an error in ijtihād or a misunderstanding or a shortcoming in understanding. There is no link between this and badā’.

If some person of shallow understanding understands this to be badā’ then he will be regarded as excused until the truth settles upon his mind, although in these matters ignorance should not be an excuse, especially after the truth has been expounded and the proofs put forward in such a manner that there remains no scope to reject it. In this case, an error of this nature is regarded as a grave mistake. May Allah protect us from this type of misunderstanding.

An important point to remember is where there is some scope for errors in ijtihād, it only applies to those areas where there are no *muḥkam* and *ibārat al-Naṣ* (categorical statements). In muḥkam and ibārat al-Naṣ there is no scope for exercising ijtihād. If anybody errs in these categorical aspects, then he is an ignorant man and not a man of knowledge.

In conclusion, we say that any person who recites the Qur’ān is well aware that the verses mentioning the virtues of the Ṣaḥabah are categorical in this regard. If still a person does not understand, then only Allah can make him understand.

Two other explanations of this verse and the complete uprooting of the badā’ dogma

The words “ثَلٰثِيْنَ لَيْلَةً” (thirty nights) is either *mafʿūl bihī* or *mafʿūl fīhī.*

In the first case, where it is *mafʿūl bihī*, it means that the promised duration was the thirty nights. In other words, come to Mount Ṭūr, we wish to honour you by allowing you to carry out thirty nights of special ʿibādah. This promise was fulfilled, wherein Nabī Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام was allowed thirty nights of special ʿibādah. Thereafter Allah Ta’ala from His side favoured Nabī Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام by increasing the

period and extending it to forty. This can be said to be similar to "وَلَدَيْنَا مَزِيْدٌ" (extra bounties, over and above the promised amount) or a bonus.

When the general masses of the ummah of Rasulullah ﷺ are given a ninety percent bonus, why are the Shīʿah so upset that Nabī Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام is given a one third bonus?

In this instance, the awarding of the Torah has nothing to do with this promise. The Torah was either an extra bonus, similar to "وَلَدَيْنَا مَزِيْدٌ" or the Torah was promised to Nabī Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام as a separate independent promise, which was not attached to the thirty nights. In other words, it was not to say that the thirty nights was a pre-condition for receiving the Torah.

In short, what has been promised in this verse is the ʿibādah of thirty nights. The awarding of the Torah, upon which the whole badā' doctrine is based, has not been mentioned at all.

In the second case, where the words "ثَلٰثِيْنَ لَيْلَةً" (thirty nights) is taken to be a *mafʿūl fīhī*, it would mean that the promises of Allah continued for thirty days. No mention is made of what was promised. If we accept that the promised item was the Torah, then too it does not affect us in any way, and if the promised entity was something other than the Torah, then obviously there is also no problem.

The verse means that initially for the first thirty days Nabī Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام was receiving promises and glad tidings, since one month is regarded as a lengthy period of time amongst people, that is why most contracts are also enacted for a month. So after receiving glad tiding for a month, Nabī Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام was satisfied and consoled, thereafter, to put him at greater ease, another ten days of glad tidings were given. So although the promises continued for forty days, it was not mentioned: "We continued to promise Mūsā for forty nights." Rather this form of expression was used: "We continued to promise him for thirty nights and thereafter we completed it by adding another ten nights."

Whichever meaning is taken, there is absolutely no mention that initially a time was stipulated for something to be given, and thereafter when the time came, the duration was increased. If this was the case, then the proponents of badā’ would have had something to clutch onto. This is quite apparent.

It should be remembered that this explanation we have written at the end was keeping in line with the famous saying: tit for tat, and only mentioned as an

argumentative point with the opponent, otherwise the truth itself is manifest to the seeker of the truth.

Conclusion on the discussion of badā’

The Shīʿah claim that badā’ took place, and in order to prove it they present this verse which they assume to be a proof for their claim. People of understanding know that the proof must coincide with the claim in such a way that there is no possibility for a meaning contrary to the claim. If such a possibility which is contrary to the claim exists, then too to such an extent that it is not just a mere possibility but rather much more appropriate and fitting than the claim, moreso if contrary to the claim is directly understood from it, and there are other proofs which substantiate the contrary and reject the claim made; then an intelligent person will never accept such a claim, rather he will regard the contrary to be true.

And this is exactly the case here. It is not hidden from people of understanding.

By the favour of Allah, we have completely uprooted the concept of badā’ and by doing so, we have also answered those people who proffer the excuse of badā’.

When in the Qur’ān mention is made of the virtues of the three khulafā, the muhājirīn and the anṣār, and the great promises made to them by Allah Ta’ala are enumerated, then these people use the excuse of badā’ and say that these praises were mentioned by mistake, and only thereafter Allah Ta’ala came to know the actual state of the Ṣaḥabah.

Since we have proven the falsehood of the badā' concept, there remains no need for us to bring forth the statements of their own A'immah that prove badā' to be unacceptable.

Discussion on the A'immah possessing knowledge of 'ilm al-ghayb (knowledge of the unseen)

To add salt to the wound, we say that if their A'immah - who (according to them) possessed knowledge of what transpired and what is going to transpire - have praised the khulafā or the Ṣaḥabah, then there is no scope for any doubt (since they are free from badā').

Subhān Allah! They are not at ease and are not convinced with the speech of Allah, but are convinced and at ease with the statements of the A'immah!

First of all, there are hundreds of verses which prove that besides Allah Ta'ala, no one else possesses knowledge of the unseen. To put them at ease, we will mention a few of these verses:

وَمَا تَدْرِىْ نَفْسٌ مَّاذَا تَكْسِبُ غَدًا

> No soul knows what it will do tomorrow.[1]

In this verse, there is no exception, therefore every soul, whether that of an imām or non-imām, is equal in his ignorance of what is to happen tomorrow.

قُلْ لَّا يَعْلَمُ مَنْ فِى السَّمٰوٰتِ وَ الْاَرْضِ الْغَيْبَ اِلَّا اللّٰهُ

> Say O Muḥammad ﷺ! No one in the skies or the earth knows the unseen except Allah.[2]

1 Sūrah Luqmān: 34

2 Sūrah al-Naml: 65

By accepting that the A’immah have knowledge of the past and future, one has to accept that they equal Allah in knowledge

Furthermore, if one accepts that the A’immah have knowledge of the past and future, one has to accept that they are equal to Allah in knowledge, whereas Allah Taʿālā mentions in Sūrah Yūsuf:

وَفَوْقَ كُلِّ ذِیْ عِلْمٍ عَلِیْمٌ

> Above every knowledgeable person is one who is more knowledgeable.

If one were to object and say that this verse informs us that there must be someone who has more knowledge than Allah also, since it has mentioned as a rule that: “Above every knowledgeable person is one who is more knowledgeable”, without any distinction between Allah and others.

We would reply that first of all people of understanding do not regard this objection as worthy of answering, and secondly, if we accept that it requires answering then who is not aware that intelligence demands that Allah Ta’ala be automatically exempted.

Look at just this one verse:

اِنَّ اللّٰهَ عَلٰى كُلِّ شَیْءٍ قَدِیْرٌ

> Verily Allaah has power over all things.

Up to this day, no fool has ever said that if Allah has power over everything then he will have the power to destroy Himself or to create a partner for Himself. Everyone understands that Allah Ta’ala has the power of creating and removing life from the ambiyā’ and the A’immah. In a similar manner, even the most ignorant of people do not understand from this verse: “Above every knowledgeable person is one who is more knowledgeable” that there is someone more knowledgeable than Allah. Therefore, if anyone brings about such an argument, then it can only be said to be on account of his ignorance and prejudice.

An exceptional point

Despite this, the wording of the verse itself has an indication to the answer. Also in the verse:

اِنَّ اللّٰهَ عَلٰى كُلِّ شَيْءٍ قَدِيْرٌ

> Verily Allaah has power over all things.

the word "شيء" (all things) has an indication to the answer of the aforementioned apprehension as well. The explanation of this is that the words "ذي علم" (one who possesses knowledge) and "عليم" (knowledgeable) even though seem to have the same meaning, "ذي علم" (one who possesses knowledge) has the added meaning of the person being the bearer of knowledge (and knowledge being a completely separate entity from him) because the connection of *iḍhāfah* (possession) necessitates them being separate entities. On the other hand, the word "عليم" (knowledgeable) does not have this added feature. Therefore, since the knowledge of Allah, according to all is not a separate entity (but rather his inherent attribute), it would not be appropriate to label Him as "ذي علم" (one who possesses knowledge) especially according to the Shīʿah. Rather he should be called "عليم" (knowledgeable), just as the word "شيء" is used for those things which are subject to the will of Allah and not for Allah Himself. In summary, just as the Being of Allah does not fall under the ambit of those things subject to His will, in a similar manner Allah is not referred to by the term "ذي علم" (one who possesses knowledge), and above whom there is a more knowledgeable being.

In essence, nobody is equal to Allah Ta'ala in knowledge. Just as he is unique in his Being (dhāt), similarly he is unique in his qualities (sifāt). Neither the ambiyā', A'immah, angels, jinn, people of status nor the general public are equal to him in knowledge. With regards to this belief the Shīʿah are so extreme that they are similar to the Christians in their belief of the divinity of Nabī ʿĪsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام. The similitude of ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْهُ to ʿĪsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام that Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ has mentioned, namely:

> Your similitude to ʿĪsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام is that one group will be destroyed in their extreme love for you whilst another in their extreme hatred for you.

This likeness and similitude became apparent in the form of the Khawārij, who harboured deep hatred for ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, and the Shīʿah, whose extreme love for ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ has led them to place him above the ranks of the ambiyā’ and even made him a deity. In fact they surpassed the Christians as well (and portrayed a picture of "ولدينا مزيد"- and we have excelled you). Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ had mentioned this specifically regarding ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ only. The Shīʿah have not only rendered true this prophecy of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ but have exceeded it as well. The Khawārij have not rendered such depiction of its accuracy as the Shīʿah have. The Khawārij did not go to the same extremes in hatred as the Shīʿah did in their love. How true is the proverbial saying:

> A literate enemy is better than an illiterate friend.

Hypothetically, if we prove that the A'immah possessed complete knowledge of the past and future, the fear of badā’ still remains

If we were to accept that the A’immah had complete knowledge of the past and future, then too the fear and apprehension of badā’ taking place in the knowledge of Allah would still linger. ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ who is the most knowledgeable and superior of all the other A’immah himself has been quoted in a narration of *al-Kāfī* and *Al-ʿAmālī* of al-Ṣudūq:

لولا آية في كتاب الله لأخبرتكم بما يكون إلى يوم القيامة يريد بالآية قوله يمحو الله ما يشاء ويثبت

The summation of the above quotation from *al-Kāfī* of *al-Kulaynī* and *al-ʿAmālī* of al-Ṣadūq is that ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ said:

> If it were not for one verse of the Quran (viz. "Allah erases whatever He wills and keeps in place (whatever He wills"), I would have informed you of all to take place until the Day of Qiyāmah.

This is the crux of the narration. If one were to ponder over this deeply then the very proof of the A'immah having complete knowledge of the past and future itself proves that their knowledge does not exceed the knowledge of Allah. Thus, the very reason which renders the knowledge of Allah uncertain (i.e. badā') has the same effect upon the knowledge of the A'immah. They too were wary of badā' taking place and thus had no reliance and contentment in their knowledge. This thought might be a means of intense grief for the Shīʿah, that their entire religion has been washed down the drain; because if the A'immah themselves had no reliance upon their knowledge, what reliance can there be upon a religion centered upon their knowledge?

We too are delighted to know that the vulgarities leveled at the first three khulafā and the other muhājirīn and anṣār from the A'immah, turning a blind eye to the integrity and reliability of those who narrated it (which was discussed previously), are no longer reliable or relevant. The same will apply to everything else narrated in their books which opposes the Ahl al-Sunnah.

One doubt still remains, supposedly if badā' had taken place then too it was to a minimal amount. The response to this would be that even a minimal amount is sufficient to remove reliance. The Torah and Injīl were interpolated and changed, which discredited and nullified its authenticity, but it was only a few verses and not the entire scripture thereof.

The virtues of the khulafā and the Ṣaḥābah in the words of ʿAlī رضي الله عنه and the other A'immah

If anyone were to state:

> Whatever was revealed in the Noble Qur'ān regarding the virtues of the Ṣaḥābah or indicates the high ranking of the khulafā was revealed before the demise of most of them and thus holds no weight, as consideration is given to the end result. Therefore there is the possibilty of error in the word of Allah. However, that which Amīr al-Mu'minīn or any of the other

> A’immah said, it was stated after their demise and therefore does not have the possibility of error. Thus, if the virtues of the Ṣaḥābah, and especially the first three khulafā, are proven from their statements then there is no scope for denial.

Therefore, I will now present the narrations of the A’immah. *Nahj al-Balāghah* of Allāmah al-Raḍi, which is regarded by the Shīʿah to be mutawātir, states that when Amīr al-Mu’mineen ʿAlī رضي الله عنه was asked about those who passed away, he mentioned those qualities which denotes their absolute closeness to Allah Taʿālā. The eloquent narration is quoted below verbatim:

كانوا إذا ذكروا الله هملت أعينهم حتى تبل جباههم مادوا كما يميد الشجر يوم الريح العاصف خوفا من العقاب ورجاء للثواب

On another occasion he said regarding them:

كان أحب اللقاء إليهم لقاء الله وإنهم يتقلبون على مثل الجمر من ذكر معادهم

The summary of both these narrations is that the condition of the Ṣaḥābah was such that when they remembered Allah tears flowed from their eyes until it wet their cheeks and they swayed out of fear of Allah and in hope of his reward, as a tree sways on an extremely windy day. They were most desirous of meeting Allah and they tossed and turned with great agitation on the mention of the Hereafter, as if they were rolling on live coals.

A lengthy supplication has also been related from Imām al-Sajjād رحمه الله in *Ṣaḥifah-e Kāmilah* containing praises of the Ṣaḥābah. Brevity does not allow us to reproduce the entire dua and so we will suffice upon a few phrases thereof. The dua states:

اللهم وأصحاب محمد خاصة الذين حسنوا الصحابة

It thereafter goes on to say:

فارقوا الأزواج والأولاد في إظهار كلمته وقاتلوا الآباء والأبناء في تثبيت نبوته

Thereafter it asserts:

فلا تنسى لهم اللهم ما تركوا لك وفيك وأرضهم من رضوانك

He then makes mention of the Tābi'īn with a similar supplication being mentioned for them.

The summary of these words are:

> O Allah! And the companions of Rasūlullāh ﷺ who have fulfilled the right of his companionship; they have left their wives and children for the upliftment of his dīn and have fought their own fathers and sons for the establishment of his nubuwwah, thus O Allah! Do not overlook their sacrifices for Your sake and bless them with happiness from Your happiness and pleasure from Your pleasure.

This is the crux of the supplication mentioned above, which openly declares the virtue and nobility of the Ṣaḥābah.

The virtues of Abu Bakr al-Ṣiddiq

Now listen to what is proven with regards to the virtues of Abu Bakr al-Ṣiddiq رضي الله عنه. The following is narrated in *Nahj al-Balāghah*, which according to the Shīʿah is similar to divine revelation:

> عن أمير المؤمنين أنه قال لله بلاد أبي بكر فلقد قوم الأود وداوى العمد وأقام السنة وخلف البدعة ذهب نقي الثوب قليل العيب صاحب خيرها وسبق شرها أدى الى الله طاعته واتقاه بحقه رحل وتركهم في طريق متشعبة لايهتدي فيها الضال ولايستيقن المهتدي
>
> Amīr al-Mu'minīn ʿAlī رضي الله عنه is reported to have said: "For Allah alone is the lands of Abu Bakr[1] (i.e. he possesses great traits bestowed by Allah). By the

1 Because the land of Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه was Allah's land, therefore the quality desired by Allah became apparent in it and it is obvious that he who is for Allah will be a possessor of great perfection.

> oath of Allah, he straightened the crookedness, mended the pillar, elevated the sunnah, relegated innovations and he departed from the world with a clean slate. He was blessed with an exceptional reign and passed free of its trying times. He fulfilled his submission to Allah and feared Him as He deserves to be feared. He went away and left the people in dividing ways wherein the misled cannot attain guidance and the guided cannot attain certainty.”

This is the summary of the above mentioned sermon.

The discrepancies of Allāmah al-Raḍī which were unsuccessful

Now we would like to bring to the notice of the readers that Allāmah al-Raḍī, to lend favour to denomination, changed the word “Abū Bakr” to “Fulān” (someone) so that the Ahl al-Sunnah would not be able to benefit from this narration, which is nothing new at all. However, he did not realise that there would be no benefit in hiding the name. There were only three successors before ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and thus regardless of who was intended, it will most definitely result in an advantageous situation for the Ahl al-Sunnah. Moreover, these are such qualities mentioned herein that fit the personality of Abu Bakr al-Ṣiddiq رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ perfectly, especially the first two qualities which are of such a nature that besides Abu Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ they fit no one else. No other khilāfah had crookedness to condend with and had to rectify a deficiency in one of the pillars of Islam.

Without a doubt, it was Abu Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ who had to face the scurge of infidelity which arouse at the demise of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and of people denying the obligation of zakāh, which is one of the pillars of Islam. These trials are synonymous with the name of Abu Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. It was these blessings, orderly management and successful endeavours that were deeply entrenched in the heart of ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and well-known to the Shīʿah, whether they muster the courage to admit it or not. This is what triggered ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ to reminisce over the days wherein he witnessed the trials and tribulations unfolding in his era and lamented over the absence of a personality of that calibre.

The bravery of al-Ṣiddiq and his steadfastness

Why should it not be such for Abu Bakr al-Ṣiddiq رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ, who stood firm at the demise of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى ٱللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ when the scourge of infidelity arouse from all sides and the majority of the Ṣaḥābah were left bewildered to such an extent that even ʿUmar رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ - who was a mountain of courage, sternness and deep foresight - was left baffled. It was then that Abu Bakr رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ said to him in order to stir up his unrelenting valour:

أجبار في الجاهلية وخوار في الإسلام

> O ʿUmar رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ! Were you a forceful dictator in the days of kufr but cowardly in Islam?

ʿUmar رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ was of the opinion that it would be preferable not to despatch the army of Usāmah ibn Zayd رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ and thus leave Madīnah void of an army, leaving it open to attack. However, it was on account of the courage and steadfastness of Abu Bakr رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ, who in the face of all this turmoil was not alarmed, and emphatically stated that how is it possible for me to to hesistate regarding that contingent which was prepared by none other than Rasūlullāh صَلَّى ٱللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ?

In a similar manner, when he intended despatching an army against the infidels, which most of the Ṣaḥābah disagreed with, he said that if no one is ready to stand up I will take up arms against them single-handed.

In this instace as well, when it came to those denying the obligation of zakāh and ʿUmar رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ held reservations regarding them on account of them proclaiming the kalimah, it was Abu Bakr رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ once again who saved the day saying: "I would not hesitate in waging war against he who differentiates between salāh and zakāh by calling one Fardh and not the other. By the oath of Allah! If they desist from giving even a lamb which they discharged in the era of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى ٱللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, I would not think twice in waging war with them."

In short, it was his courage, bravery and farsightedness which prompted him to adopt these stances and thereby preserve dīn in its pristine form, saving it from endless regression and deterioration.

This is why, Amīr al-Mu'minīn Alī رضي الله عنه when witnessing the disorder and trials in his era recalled the steadfastness of Abu Bakr رضي الله عنه. This is in conformity to the wording of the sermon itself and these attributes match none other than Abu Bakr رضي الله عنه. This is why most commentators of *Nahj al-Balāghah* hold the opinion that it refers to Abu Bakr رضي الله عنه. If they still remain obstinate then the most they are able to do is presume it refers to a personality who passed away in the time of Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم, as was done by some bias commentators. Since it is the duty of the commentators to expound on the meaning as well, we ask why should it refer to this unknown man (who passed away during the lifetime of Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم) since all achievements in the time of Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم were his accomplishments and no other can take credit for it. Furthermore, it is impossible that Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم himself was referred to because then why would ʿAlī رضي الله عنه refer to him as "fulān" (someone) How disrespectful would that be that he refer to Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم in such an unbefitting manner!

Platform of praise is one of exposure and not one of ambiguity

Then too, what prompted him to adopt such a means of concealment and ambiguity in a platform of praise, which is a place of exposure and precision. Instead, considering the fact that this is a platform of praise, it appears to me that this is most definitely appreciation of Abu Bakr رضي الله عنه and this ambiguity is without a doubt the result of erasure and interpolation of the enemies of the Ṣaḥābah. If this were not the case then there was no fear in exposing the name of Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم that would compel one to hide it. If Abu Bakr رضي الله عنه were implied then it would necessitate concealment (by the Shīʿah) so that these praises should not be awarded to him (even if in the interim, by conferring it to Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم, one will be accused of hatred and enmity for Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم). If they are prepared to attribute these qualities to Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم and thereby accept the accusation of enmity against Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم, since this will be the

presumed reason for concealing his name, then well and good, on condition these qualities accommodate such attribution. However, to begin with, what would be the meaning of elevating the sunnah and relegating innovations? Ask whosoever you please as to what comes to mind when "elevating the sunnah" is said? It is apparent that elevation only takes place after the presence and decline of a thing, otherwise what will be elevated?

Listen well! Those commands issued by Rasūlullāh ﷺ and those actions carried out by his noble countenance are not termed as elevation of the sunnah, rather it is itself the sunnah. Notwithstanding this, after the rulings of sunnah had been established, which of them suffered a decline and fall, and consequently was corrected and elevated by Rasūlullāh ﷺ?

Nevertheless, do as you please, these qualities inevitably link up to Abu Bakr رضي الله عنه. It is the marvelous nature of ʿAlī's رضي الله عنه speech, that despite Allāmah al-Raḍī's attempts to alter it, it inevitably returns to its true meaning and the blame falls on none other than himself. Surprisingly, it did not even occur to him, that who will use such ambiguous terms whilst praising someone? After the truth has been articulated it requires an art to camouflage it!

Some commentators are of the opinion that it refers to ʿUmar رضي الله عنه, which does not harm us in the least. The reason why they attribute these qualities to him is that they claim to have attained a copy of *Nahj al- Balāghah* belonging to the author himself (i.e. Allāmah al-Raḍī) and it had ʿUmar written below the word "Fulān". Along with it, it was inscribed that the linguist, scholar and poet Fakhār ibn Maʿbad too had said this. In addition, he had asked Abu Jaʿfar Yaḥyā ibn Zayd ʿAlawī who is intended and he replied: "ʿUmar رضي الله عنه!" I thereafter asked: "Amīr al-Mu'minīn praised him to this extent?" And he replied in the affirmative.

For this reason and because the words of some other sermons wherein ʿUmar رضي الله عنه was praised contain similar wording to this, some commentators indicate that ʿUmar رضي الله عنه is referred to here. However, it appears more that praise of Abū Bakr al-Ṣiddiq رضي الله عنه was intended. However, when the Shīʿah saw that this praise

is after all for one of the three Ṣaḥābah, they said: “Let us say it is praise of ʿUmar. After all, he is the son-in-law of Amīr al-Mu’minīn, and we should have more regard for him when compared to Abu Bakr al-Ṣiddiq.”

The merits of ʿUmar in the words of ʿAlī

Al-Sammān narrates from Ẓafar ibn Ḥakīm in *Kitāb al-Muwafaqah* that when ʿUmar رضي الله عنه passed away, he said: “Let me go to ʿAlī رضي الله عنه and hear what he has to say. When I reached his gathering, many people were waiting for him. After a while, ʿAlī رضي الله عنه arrived. First he dropped his blessed head, then he raised it and said:

> لله در باكية عمر، وا عمراه، وا عمراه! قوم الأود وأبد العمد، مات نقي الثوب، قليل العيب، وا عمراه! ذهب بالسنة واتقى الفتنة، أصاب والله ابن الخطاب خيرها ونجى من شرها، ولقد نظر له صاحبه فصار على الطريقة ما استقامت، ثم مال فقال: ورحل المركب فتشعبهم الطريق، لا يهتدي الضال ولا يستيقن المهتدي.

The meaning of this text is also very similar to the first narration. Hence, some commentators, who have already been mentioned, consider the previous narration to refer to ʿUmar رضي الله عنه. However, when one studies the attributes mentioned herein, he will conclude that it can only fit Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه, as has been dicussed earlier. Nevertheless, the corresponding words of these two narrations does not necessitate that both be in praise of one person. If it is deduced that they refer to different people then too, it will not be farfetched. In any case, the rule of ʿUmar رضي الله عنه was a completion of the rule Abū Bakr al-Ṣiddiq رضي الله عنه. Abū Bakr al-Ṣiddiq رضي الله عنه established the foundations of the khilāfah and then the one who attained the victories over Syria and Iraq (ʿUmar رضي الله عنه) was appointed his first successor. Furthermore, he was the one who correctly rooted all the necessities of rulership. Hence, it is not hidden from the experts of history that he was the founder of the laws of governance, while ʿUmar رضي الله عنه was the one who implemented them. In other words, Abu Bakr رضي الله عنه paved a path which ʿUmar رضي الله عنه treaded. Due to the fact that ʿUmar رضي الله عنه completed the efforts of Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه, it would make sense for him to also be described with the very same attributes contained in the above-mentioned first narration.

Chapter five

The belief of taqiyyah

Nevertheless, if the Shīʿah assert that they bear enmity for the first three khulafā because of what the A'immah have said about them, we have shattered the premise of this excuse as well. Yet we know that the Shīʿah will not abandon the prejudice which spurs them on hating the Ṣaḥābah in a misconstrued sense of love for the Ahl al-Bayt. Thus, it will not be surprising for them to proclaim:

> What weight does the words of the A'immah carry? After all, they spent their entire lives in *taqiyyah* (dissimulation), referring to truth as falsehood and falsehood as the truth. When Amīr al-Mu'minīn ʿAlī رضي الله عنه, despite being the lion of Allah and called by the title Walī Allāh, feared the first three khulafā to such an extent that let alone during their lifetime even during his own khilāfah he could not announce the truth. If this was his state then what need be said of others? We will never accept these narrations; either disprove the belief of taqiyyah or present some other narration wherein they did not practice taqiyyah.

As a result, this unworthy one is forced to expose the reality of taqiyyah as well. This is the ultimate result of prejudice, look to what extent such bias has led them. One is left utterly astonished at that religion which would dare to conjure up concepts such as badā' and taqiyyah.

When the Ahl al-Sunnah present a proof from the Qur'ān then the excuse of badā' was presented and when the words of the A'immah quoted then they are accused of taqiyyah. In essence, whoever invented this religion of Shī'asm was extremely cunning or perhaps a complete dunce, who could not differentiate between a coin and a seed. How sad indeed that such people have been ensnared by these concepts. They could not understand that these whimsical notions have no relation to the dīn of Allah and are but murmurings of those intellectually deprived. If only they did then ʿAbd Allāh ibn Sabā and his disciples would not

have succeeded and the principles of Shīʿasm would not have been recorded. Nonetheless, we will reply to this trick of the Shīʿah as well, perhaps Allah might guide someone through it.

Taqiyyah in light of Shīʿah narration

Firstly, the excuse of taqiyyah cannot be presented for the narrations quoted previously, especially the first two as Imām Sajjād Zayn al-ʿĀbidīn رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّهُ praised these Ṣaḥābah while imploring and supplicating to Allah. What reason is there to observe taqiyyah with Allah? If one was addressing a human then there would be a possibility of the addressee being biased towards the Ṣaḥābah and the need to appease him with such sentiments would be understood. However, if Allah Taʿālā is accused of such bias then this proves the point of the Ahl al-Sunnah as this proves that Allah himself favours the Ṣaḥābah and the Shīʿah should ponder over their own state. Furthermore, it will prove the Ṣaḥābah to have been on the dīn of truth as Allah is with them and the Qur'ān is filled with verses such as:

اِنَّ اللّٰهَ يُحِبُّ الْمُتَّقِيْنَ

Allah is with the pious.

In addition, there is no possibility of Allah also fearing the first three khulafā, Allah forbid. If the Shīʿah believe such things then it will come as no surprise to us, as they believe the taqiyyah of ʿAlī رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ to be no less, since he was the lion of Allah after all.

Control of death, knowledge of the unseen, untold bravery; why the need for taqiyyah then?

Then too, death was in his control. al-Kulaynī has proven that death is in the control of the A'immah. In fact, it is not only al-Kulaynī but all the scholars of the Imāmiyyah are unanimous that the A'immah have knowledge of the past, present and future, to the extent that they knew the precise moment and at whose

hand they would be martyred. Yet they still chose to endure such 'disgrace' and 'difficulty' with the knowledge that all their enemies would be unable to harm them or even steal a cent from them. Aside from this infinite knowledge, they were also blessed with such valour that they could fight an entire army and such miraculous feats that they could lift the entire fortress door of Khaybar; what then is the reality of Abū Bakr and ʿUmar رضي الله عنهما before them?

Why then should they fear Abū Bakr and ʿUmar رضي الله عنهما? Is there any difference then in accusing them of taqiyyah and accusing Allah of taqiyyah? Moreover, Abū Bakr and ʿUmar رضي الله عنهما were not even present at that time, having passed away many years prior to this, and it is obvious that even a jackal is not afraid of the deceased; so how then is it possible for the lion of Allah to be afraid? To what extent will we continue arguing this preposterous notion, my intention was to point out that adopting taqiyyah while supplicating, which is a time when one converses with his Rabb, is the same as the munāfiqīn performing ṣalāh or even worse. The munāfiqīn intended to fool people with their actions and according to the Shīʿah paradigm, Imām al-Sajjād رحمه الله intended to fool Allah (Allah forbid). We know this for sure and the Shīʿah do as well, regardless of how foolish they may be; the ibādah of Imām al-Sajjād رحمه الله was free from any possibility of *Riyā* (insincerity), thus there is no question of him trying to please any khalīfah or member of the Ahl al-Sunnah in his ibādah. The only excuse left (for the Shīʿah) is to say that he supplicated in this manner on account of the 'favouritism' Allah showed to the khulafā, so that Allah would not become angry on account of his disregard for them. We seek Allah's protection from such blasphemy; assuming that he practiced taqiyyah in such matters destroys the foundations of dīn from whichever angle you look at it. If one were to assume that taqiyyah was practiced here as well, it would result in one harbouring misgivings towards Allah, (Allah is far greater and pure from such matters) or towards the A'immah (we beseech Allah's protection from such beliefs). Nevertheless, these enemies of the Ahl al-Bayt will ascribe anything to the A'immah under the pretence of taqiyyah.

ʿAlī رضي الله عنه recited an eulogy for Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه after his demise, when there was no fear for his life

Imām al-Sajjād رحمه الله aside, after all he was 'oppressed' by his enemies and did not have the same valour as Amīr al-Mu'minīn ʿAlī رضي الله عنه, neither did he possess the miraculous powers which he had; so if someone were to attribute taqiyyah to him perhaps the foolish may believe it. However, the great calamity is that the practice of taqiyyah is ascribed to ʿAlī رضي الله عنه as well, despite his courage, valour, knowledge, and miraculous powers from the era of the first three khulafā and throughout his own. It is assumed that he took false oaths upon ten such qualities that if the sky were to fall on account of it or the earth split open, it would not be surprising. Let alone these qualities being the exact qualities possessed by the ambiyā' and let alone that it was mentioned for Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه, who according to the Shīʿah is worse than shayṭān himself (such that they regard cursing him not only as meritorious but absolving oneself from him as obligatory). If they regard it as greater than this then too it would be no surprise as Allah says:

> Whoever performs one good deed will receive ten reward in return.

Thus, they may regard this obligatory act of theirs to be the greatest deed in the world.

Furthermore, the cursing of the first two khulafā has become so commonplace that it is recorded in their books that to curse the first two khulafā in the morning is equal to seventy good deeds. Adding to the insult is that they regard cursing shayṭān, Namrūd, Shaddād, Firʿoun, Abū Jahal, Umayyah ibn Khalaf, and Abū Lahab, as well as the other enemies of Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم, as having no virtue at all. Nevertheless, to now praise those who are even worse than Namrūd, Firʿoun, Abū Jahal, etc, and take an oath upon them possessing ten such meritorious qualities, then too by ʿAlī رضي الله عنه whose qualities we have mentioned above, can only make sense if the meaning of kāfir is: "One who is completely obedient to Allah and submissive to him". If this is the meaning of kufr then how are they cursed or

rejected? The Shīʿah can curse all they like but they will have to accept this reality.

> I am referring to you and very pleased am I, may Allah be pleased with you as well; you have said the correct thing

Sometimes a bitter answer is superior than pearls and sugar

Allah Taʿālā is indeed pure, look to what extent they have destroyed the 'infallibility' and even saintliness of the A'immah. We are aware that the Khawārij might be two steps ahead of the Shīʿah but by only that much that the Shīʿah selectively ascribe faults whereas the Khawārij like a man in a frenzy slaps out at all.

The narrations of the Shīʿah themselves refutes any possibility of taqiyyah

Ultimately the excuse that the A'immah praised the first three khulafā and the muhājirīn and anṣār under the pretence of taqiyyah, aside from being illogical, is utterly refuted by the fables reported by the Shīʿah in their most relied upon ḥadīth compilations. It is impossible to quote all of these narrations in this treatise but as an example we will quote a few, which will indicate the manner that ʿAlī رضي الله عنه always announced the truth and himself remained distant from falsehood. Once this is established and the condition of the leader of the A'immah becomes known then the condition of the other A'immah will also become known.

Amīr al-Mu'minīn orders one to be truthful in all circumstances

The following statement of ʿAlī رضي الله عنه has been reported in *Nahj al-Balāghah*, which is considered to be an authentic book by the Shīʿah, and is a clear proof for the refutation of taqiyyah:

علامة الايمان ايثارك الصدق حيث يضرك على الكذب حيث ينفعك

> The sign of īmān is giving preference to speaking the truth, when it could harm you, over falsehood which could benefit you.

This narration implies that whoever performs taqiyyah is void of īmān because the sign of īmān is that one still speak the truth even if harm may befall his person or wealth.

The bravery of the Imām and his desire for Jannah

The second narration is also from *Nahj al-Balāghah*:

> قال امير المؤمنين انى و الله لو لقيتهم واحدا و هم طلاع الارض كلها ما با ليت و لا استوحشت و انى من ضلالتهم التى هم فيها و الهدى الذى انا عليه لعلى بصيرة من نفسى و يقين من ربى و انى الى لقاء الله و لحسن ثوابه لمنتظر راج

> ʿAlī رضي الله عنه said: "If I had to confront them on my own and their numbers filled the entire earth, I still would not care nor would I fear. I have clear vision of the deviance they are upon and the guidance I am on and have complete conviction upon it from my Rabb. I hope to meet Allah and His gracious reward.

Ponder for a moment, a person who does not fear taking on the entire world, not worried by it in the least, and instead desires Jannah and the reward of Allah, what does their practice of taqiyyah mean? If such people have also become afraid (and resorted to taqiyyah) then Qiyāmah has indeed arrived. Furthermore, taqiyyah cannot be done except under fear and then too fear for one's life, which the A'immah do not experience as control of their life is in their hands. Al-Kulaynī has established this and all Shīʿah are in agreement upon it. So who should he fear and why should he be afraid? In addition, the A'immah have knowledge of the past, present and future, they know how and when they are going to die and that they will not die before that.

The ambiyā' are instructed to be patient, tolerant and always speak the truth

If there is indeed fear for one's wealth and honour then it is the duty of the ambiyā' and the A'immah to bear this difficulty, to be patient and tolerant and not be bothered by the snubs or strength of the enemy. This is the reason why Nabī Ibrāhīm عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام did not hide from Namrūd and accepted instead to be thrown into the fire. Nabī Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام did not fear Firʿoun and was eventually forced to leave Egypt. Nabī Nūḥ عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام endured difficulty for nine hundred years, which the Shīʿah must have also heard of. The story of how Nabī Yaḥyā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام and Nabī Zakariyyā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام were murdered is known to all and sundry. We ask the Shīʿah to be just and tell us; were they not killed only because they announced the truth? Honour aside, here they sacrificed their lives. Amīr al-Mu'minīn ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ (according to Shīʿah belief) even if you say was not better than the ambiyā', you most certainly regard him to be equal to them, why then did he shy away from their practice?

If taqiyyah was incumbent then the martyrdom of Ḥusayn رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ would be a sin

Even the son of Amīr al-Mu'minīn, the leader of the martyrs, Ḥusayn رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, sacrificed his life in the path of Allah; if taqiyyah was the sunnah of ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and the compulsory decree of Allah then in which circumstance would it be more incumbent to practice taqiyyah then when you and your family are surrounded by thirty thousand blood thirsty soldiers? No water to drink, no place to take shelter and all they seek is for you to accept the pledge of allegiance to Yazīd. Their lives were lost and their wealth taken, the horrors of that day is known to all, but sadly they failed to practice upon the *farḍ* (compulsory) decree upon the Ahl al-Bayt, earning for themselves the mark of sin and drawing upon himself the blood of all those who lost their lives with him. If this is taqiyyah then we are certain that absolving oneself from it is better than having to believe that Ḥusayn رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ destroyed his world and ākhirah, Allah forbid. I swear by Allah, uttering such words (even if hypothetical) sends a shiver down my spine but Allah Taʿālā

is the Knower of the Unseen, He knows that whatever I said was not because of taqiyyah but only to refute the deviant sect called the Shīʿah and that this unworthy one is a servant of the Ahl al-Bayt and regards them as the leaders of the saints, the most truthful and sincere, the best of those who do good, the pinnacles of piety and my beloveds, nothing like the empty and false claims of the Shīʿah.

The Imām strikes awe into ʿUmar رضي الله عنه with his miraculous feat

The third narration is of al-Rāwandī, who is a Shīʿah religious leader and commentator on *Nahj al-Balāghah*, he reports from Salmān al-Fārsī رضي الله عنه in *Jarā'ih al-Jawā'ih*:

ان على بلغه عن عمر انه ذكر شيعته فاستقبله فى بعض طرقات البساتين المدينة فى يد على قوس فقال يا
عمر بلغنى عنك ذكرك لشيعتى فقال اربع على صلعتك فقال على انك لههنا ثم رمى بالقوس على الارض
فاذا هى ثعبان كالبعيرفاغرا فاه و قد اقبل نحو عمر لتبلعه فقال عمر الله الله يا ابا الحسن لاعدت بعدها فى
شىء و جعل يتفرع اليه فضرب يده الى الثعبان فعادت القوس كما كانت فمضى عمر الى بيته...الخ

This narration is extremely lengthy and to what extent should I report it, when the intended purpose is achieved by this portion. I will now explain the meaning of it. Salmān al-Fārsī رضي الله عنه narrates that news reached ʿAlī رضي الله عنه that ʿUmar رضي الله عنه was speaking ill of his Shīʿah. It just so happened that they crossed paths in one of the pathways of the gardens of Madinah. ʿAlī رضي الله عنه said: "ʿUmar it has reached me that you speak ill of my Shīʿah?" ʿUmar رضي الله عنه replied: "Take mercy upon yourself and stop." ʿAlī رضي الله عنه answered: "This is the level you have reached?" He then threw his bow to the ground and it turned into a huge serpent, the size of a camel with its mouth open. It proceeded forward, intending to strike ʿUmar رضي الله عنه. ʿUmar رضي الله عنه cried out: "O Abū al-Ḥasan! For Allah's sake (Stop!), for Allah's sake (Stop!), in future I will never say such things." He then began trembling. ʿAlī رضي الله عنه stretched his hand towards the serpent and it once again turned into a bow. ʿUmar رضي الله عنه then returned to his home.

This was the translation of the above and after reading it, the entire backbone of

taqiyyah is broken. ʿUmar رضي الله عنه was an awe-inspiring personality from amongst the khulafā and the Ṣaḥābah and the Ahl al-Sunnah often mention this with great pride yet he is subdued with one simple magic trick.

This makes it clear that the silence of ʿAlī رضي الله عنه upon the actions of Abū Bakr and ʿUmar رضي الله عنهما, even when witnessing Fadak being 'stolen', wedding his daughter to ʿUmar رضي الله عنه, pledging his allegiance to them, performing ṣalāh behind them, etc were all because he regarded them to be worthy of this honour and not because of taqiyyah. Since he was a person so brave, so strong, and capable of such miraculous feats; no one would dare to cross paths with him. Furthermore, if any person was blessed with such strength and such extraordinary powers, he would never allow his daughter to be forcefully taken from him. In India, not even the plumber or clothes washer will allow his daughter to be taken from him in such a manner as ʿAlī رضي الله عنه allowed his daughter to be taken from him by ʿUmar رضي الله عنه. In addition when one looks at the sons of ʿAlī رضي الله عنه; one was such that he took on an entire army of thirty thousand men in his old age whereas in the prime of his youth, his sister was snatched from him and he did nothing. On the other hand in the narrations of the incident of Karbala, it has been narrated that when the enemy advanced with the intention of taking the honour of the women of the Ahl al-Bayt, he rose in anger. The Shīʿah are well-acquainted with the incidents of Karbala and there is no need to mention it at this juncture.

Taqiyyah in light of logic and common practice

In essence, the narrations of the Shīʿah themselves uproot the possibility of practicing taqiyyah, and it is not only the Ahl al-Sunnah. There remains no need for any further discussion as this is sufficient for the fair-minded intellectual. However, in order to complete the proof and to elaborate further, it is only appropriate to weigh the practice of taqiyyah in terms of logical reasoning and common practice of society, so that the eyes of the Shīʿah may open. If we were to examine taqiyyah logically then the practice of taqiyyah by the ambiyā' and A'immah is the equivalent of appointing a teacher to tutor your children and instead of teaching them the subject matter, acts the same as them; playing,

hopping, skipping and jumping. Allah Taʿālā making taqiyyah incumbent upon the ambiyā' and A'immah is the same as the administration of an Islamic institution instructing the educators to teach the children but not utter a word, to teach them etiquette and manners but not object to their actions, warn them but not rebuke them, in fact do not say anything to them; if they play then you play along with them.

We ask the fair-minded if this is in any way logical and if there is any difference between this and the practice of taqiyyah by the ambiyā' and A'immah? Furthermore, to practice taqiyyah to such an extent that the entire dīn has been destroyed, the entire ummah led astray; in such a scenario it would befit one to rise up and announce the truth openly, even if your honour and your wealth were to be destroyed, and not play with your words. Despite this, the Shīʿah still firmly believe that the dīn of the Shīʿah is in complete accordance with logic and it is incumbent to follow logic. One can only marvel at the appreciation the Shīʿah have for Allah Taʿālā, when this is their attitude towards Allah Taʿālā who has the right to complain? Firstly, they made Allah the obedient and absolved themselves from Him being "The wisest of those who pass judgement", which He mentions in the Qur'ān. Secondly, they ascribe the order of such a practice to Him, which according to their logic necessitates Allah becoming a sinner. Allah Taʿālā is indeed pure from such slander.

Taqiyyah in light of the Qur'ān

If one were to ask what is the status of taqiyyah in light of the Qur'ān, then there are hundreds of verses which denigrate such taqiyyah (which the Shīʿah practice and ascribe to the A'immah). In fact, Allah Taʿālā has expressed the exact opposite, mentioning praise for not practicing taqiyyah, such that even when one's life is in danger, it is more praiseworthy not to practice taqiyyah. If the Shīʿah on account of them being unable to remember the Qur'ān were to accuse me of giving false references then check for yourself whether the following verse is present in Sūrah al-Baqarah:

اَمْ حَسِبْتُمْ اَنْ تَدْخُلُوا الْجَنَّةَ وَ لَمَّا يَاْتِكُمْ مَّثَلُ الَّذِيْنَ خَلَوْا مِنْ قَبْلِكُمْ ؕ مَسَّتْهُمُ الْبَاْسَآءُ وَالضَّرَّآءُ وَ زُلْزِلُوْا حَتّٰى يَقُوْلَ الرَّسُوْلُ وَالَّذِيْنَ اٰمَنُوْا مَعَهٗ مَتٰى نَصْرُ اللّٰهِ ؕ اَلَآ اِنَّ نَصْرَ اللّٰهِ قَرِيْبٌ ﴿۲۱۴﴾

> Do you think that you will enter Jannah when there has not yet come to you the like of (those hardships such as poverty, famine, illness and fear which came to) the people before you? Suffering and hardship affected them and they were shaken until the Rasūl and those with him who had īmān said: "When will the help of Allah come?" Surely, the help of Allah is near."[1]

Also read the verse in Sūrah Āl Imrān:

وَكَاَيِّنْ مِّنْ نَّبِيٍّ قٰتَلَ ۙ مَعَهٗ رِبِّيُّوْنَ كَثِيْرٌ ۚ فَمَا وَهَنُوْا لِمَآ اَصَابَهُمْ فِىْ سَبِيْلِ اللّٰهِ وَمَا ضَعُفُوْا وَمَا اسْتَكَانُوْا ؕ وَاللّٰهُ يُحِبُّ الصّٰبِرِيْنَ ﴿۱۴۶﴾

> Many were the Prophets with whom large numbers of righteous men fought. They never lost courage with all (the hardship and difficulties) that afflicted them in the path of Allah (even though they were hurt, faced enormous difficulties and their prophets were killed), neither did they weaken or become helpless. Allah loves the steadfast ones.[2]

Taqiyyah deprives one of Jannah

Read these verses fairly without prejudice and gauge for yourself which course of action earns the pleasure of Allah. When this is the instruction of Allah to the ordinary mu'min it applies more to the ambiyā' and A'immah. In light of the first verse, the practice of taqiyyah deprives one of even the hope of Jannah, why then will any person resort to taqiyyah? As for the fear of befalling harm from the Ahl al-Sunnah, this has been addressed by Allah Taʿālā as well:

> Surely, the help of Allah is near.

1 Sūrah al-Baqarah: 214

2 Sūrah Āl Imrān: 146

Losing courage out of fear for the kuffār is prohibited so taqiyyah is extremely far-fetched

In the second verse, taqiyyah aside, losing courage and becoming fearful of the kuffār has been prohibited. Dislike for taqiyyah was hinted to in the portion:

وَمَا اسْتَكَانُوْا

(nor did they) become helpless.

because this means that these people did not give in to the kuffār - which in essence is what taqiyyah is - despite the hardships they had to endure. Yet in all this adversity they did not weaken their resolve nor did they become helpless and remained distant from taqiyyah, never becoming ensnared by it. How great is the planning of Allah but sadly the Shīʿah in their stubbornness are still not satisfied.

What I have said of this verse prohibiting the practice of taqiyyah requires no explanation and is apparent to those who possess knowledge, but for the sake of the Shīʿah some explanation is required. The preceding and following verses make it apparent that one should not practice taqiyyah, if one is in doubt then read it for yourself. Allah Taʿālā is relating the incidents of the previous ummah to this ummah, more specifically to the Ṣaḥābah, warning them not to become weak or helpless and thus resort to taqiyyah. We now ask the fair-minded, if a person refuses to accept these warnings (and still resorts to taqiyyah) is he from the unsuccessful ones or of the elite deserving greatest reward; as those who practice taqiyyah claim?

Taqiyyah is reproachable and not praiseworthy

The truth of the matter is that taqiyyah is deserving of reproach and not reward, which is evident from these verses. It is impossible for a person to retain the mantle of nubuwwah and imāmah while still performing taqiyyah, especially when in the manner that the Shīʿah assume Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and the A'immah

used to do with the Ṣaḥābah. Moreso when the Shīʿah consider the Ṣaḥābah to be even lesser than shayṭān, as has been alluded to previously, such that Rasūlullāh ﷺ always agreed with and conceded to what the Ṣaḥābah desired. Allah Taʿālā says in the Qur'ān:

وَلَئِنِ اتَّبَعْتَ اَهْوَآءَهُمْ بَعْدَ مَا جَآءَكَ مِنَ الْعِلْمِ ۙ مَا لَكَ مِنَ اللّٰهِ مِنْ وَّلِيٍّ وَّلَا وَاقٍ ﴿٣٧﴾

> Surely if you follow their wishes after knowledge has come to you then you shall have no helper nor saviour.[1]

It is not possible that Rasūlullāh ﷺ would follow their wishes after this verse was revealed and give precedence to their wishes over the wish and desire of Allah.

The ambiyā' only fear Allah

In essence Allah Taʿālā has prohibited even the general masses from performing taqiyyah, yet the Shīʿah consider the elite (i.e. the ambiyā') to have perpetrated it and then too perpetually, whereas the sign of those entrusted with the duty of imparting the message of Allah Taʿālā (which according to the Shīʿah includes both the ambiyā' and A'immah) has been described to be that they fear none but Allah and display no short-coming in imparting the message of Allah. The following verse is mentioned in Sūrah al-Aḥzāb:

الَّذِيْنَ يُبَلِّغُوْنَ رِسٰلٰتِ اللّٰهِ وَ يَخْشَوْنَهٗ وَلَا يَخْشَوْنَ اَحَدًا اِلَّا اللّٰهَ

> Those who propagate Allah's messages, who fear Him and do not fear anyone but Allah.[2]

This verse clearly negates any possibility of fear from the ambiyā' when imparting the message of Allah, yet you will find a Shīʿah saying that taqiyyah means to

1 Sūrah al-Raʿd: 37

2 Sūrah al-Aḥzāb: 39

conceal one's religion whether it be out of fear or for some other reason. They themselves know how illogical this is but still you will find people making such statements. However, Allah Taʿālā is the Knower of the Unseen and was well-aware of the stubbornness of the Shīʿah from before time began, which is why He began this verse saying:

> Those who propagate Allah's messages...

Emphasis on propagation

Furthermore, the ambiyā' were specifically instructed, especially the seal of the ambiyā', Muḥammad ﷺ, in order to place greater emphasis on the need for propagation and to ensure that no short-coming is perpetrated. It is mentioned Sūrah al-Ḥijr:

فَاصْدَعْ بِمَا تُؤْمَرُ وَاَعْرِضْ عَنِ الْمُشْرِكِيْنَ ﴿٩٤﴾

> Clearly announce what you have been commanded with and ignore the Mushrikīn.[1]

Thereafter repeated emphasis has been laid upon propagation stressing that there should be no deficiency in imparting the message. If you do not believe me then read it for yourself.

In addition, we have been ordered in Sūrah al-Aḥzāb:

لَقَدْ كَانَ لَكُمْ فِيْ رَسُوْلِ اللّٰهِ اُسْوَةٌ حَسَنَةٌ لِّمَنْ كَانَ يَرْجُوا اللّٰهَ وَالْيَوْمَ الْاٰخِرَ

> There is definitely an excellent example in Allah's Rasūl ﷺ for the one who fears Allah and the Last Day.[2]

This verse has made it incumbent upon the entire ummah that just as Rasūlullāh

1 Sūrah al-Ḥijr: 94

2 Sūrah al-Aḥzāb: 21

صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ does not shy away from the truth and propagating dīn, you too should not. Even more so for the A'immah, as they have been sent specifically for the probation of dīn and announcement of the truth, and according to the Shīʿah are no less than the ambiyā', if not even superior. So when they were specifically instructed then they should be more mindful of this than others.

The purpose of the ambiyā' and their deputies is to warn and convey glad-tidings

In addition, Allah Taʿālā says:

وَ مَا نُرْسِلُ الْمُرْسَلِيْنَ اِلَّا مُبَشِّرِيْنَ وَمُنْذِرِيْنَ

> We sent the messengers only as carriers of glad-tidings and as warners.[1]

"Messengers" in accordance with the terminology of the Qur'ān does not only refer to the ambiyā' but to all those who impart the message of Allah, whether they be ambiyā' or not. The verse mentioned in Sūrah Yāsīn:

اِنَّآ اِلَيْكُمْ مُّرْسَلُوْنَ

> We are messengers unto you.

Refers to the deputies of Nabī ʿĪsā عَلَيْهِ ٱلسَّلَامُ, who were not ambiyā' but rather only deputies, which is the actual meaning of imām according to the Shīʿah; deputy of the Nabī. If a person were to object that the messengers of Nabī ʿĪsā عَلَيْهِ ٱلسَّلَامُ are not referred to in this verse as the verse mentions:

اِذْ اَرْسَلْنَآ اِلَيْهِمُ اثْنَيْنِ

> When We sent two (messengers) to them.

1 Sūrah al-Kahaf: 56

Which indicates that these messengers were sent by Allah and not Nabī ʿĪsā عَلَيْهِ ٱلسَّلَامُ, then the reply to this would be that Allah Taʿālā attributed the sending of these messengers by Nabī ʿĪsā عَلَيْهِ ٱلسَّلَامُ to Himself, saying that We sent them and not that Nabī ʿĪsā عَلَيْهِ ٱلسَّلَامُ sent them. When the deputy of Nabī ʿĪsā عَلَيْهِ ٱلسَّلَامُ was acknowledged as the deputy of Allah then why should the deputy of our Rasūlullāh صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ not be recognised as the deputy of Allah as well? When they too have been sent by Allah then their duties will be in the same and in accordance with the verse:

وَ مَا نُرْسِلُ الْمُرْسَلِيْنَ اِلَّا مُبَشِّرِيْنَ وَمُنْذِرِيْنَ

We sent the messengers only as carriers of glad tidings and as warners.

We now ask, where is taqiyyah in all of this? We will never blacken our faces and envisage that Rasūlullāh صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and the pure A'immah could have ever been deficient in acting upon the order of Allah Taʿālā. They spent their day and night propagating dīn and why should they not? The verse is self-explanatory that the Nabī صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ is not deficient in propagating the message, so why should his deputies conceal the message? If this is the case then they are not his true deputies but the opposite.

The purpose of risālat is propagation

Secondly, Allah Taʿālā mentions the purpose of Rasūlullāh's صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ risālat to be the propagation and transmission of dīn. It is mentioned in Sūrah al-Fatḥ, Sūrah al-Ṣaff and Sūrah al-Taubah:

هُوَ الَّذِیْٓ اَرْسَلَ رَسُوْلَهٗ بِالْهُدٰى وَ دِیْنِ الْحَقِّ لِیُظْهِرَهٗ عَلَى الدِّیْنِ كُلِّهٖ

It is Allah Who has sent His Rasūl صَلَّى ٱللَّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ with guidance and with the true dīn so that he may make it apparent over all other religions.[1]

The dominance or becoming apparent over all religions mentioned in this

1 Sūrah al-Fatḥ: 28

verse, if attributed to Rasūlullāh ﷺ then the meaning is obvious but if the implication is that Allah Taʿālā has taken the responsibility of making dīn apparent by sending His Rasūl then whatever success will be attained by His Nabī ﷺ will be the doing of Allah. The example of Rasūlullāh ﷺ in this case will be like that of a tool used by a labourer to complete his task, which makes it clear and in fact clearer than daylight, that when the intention of Allah is to make dīn apparent, who can ever conceal it? This verse is in fact a clear proof for the veracity of the Ahl al-Sunnah because whichever Shīʿah will embrace the Sunnī faith under the guise of taqiyyah, he will conceal his beliefs of Shī'asm and make apparent the beliefs of the Ahl al-Sunnah. In this way he has acknowledged that the *madhab* (school) of the Ahl al-Sunnah is the true faith because the *dhamīr* (personal pronoun) of the word "ليظهره" (make it apparent) refers to the dīn of truth, and the faith of the Shīʿah will then be included in "All other religions", and it is obvious that all other religions are false. This verse also indicates that the propagation of dīn required by this verse should occur before the emergence of Imām al-Mahdī. The reason being that for dominance, two things are required: a dominator and the dominated. Similarly when something becomes apparent over another than it requires that the latter still remain. So the dominance and becoming apparent over mentioned in this verse, and alluded to by the words "ليظهره", indicate that this dīn will become apparent over other religions and not that the other religions will no longer exist. The Shīʿah should now inform us whether other religions will remain in the time of Imām al-Mahdī رضي الله عنه or not? In addition the word "ليظهره" (to make it apparent) is affixed to "ارسل" (sent his Rasūl) which would necessitate that it become apparent at the same time that the Rasūl ﷺ was sent. This cannot refer to any other dīn except that of the Ahl al-Sunnah, the Shīʿah should inform me whether I am true or false? After this there remains no necessity to even discuss whether taqiyyah has any relevance in dīn or not.

Propagation of dīn is compulsory upon the ambiyā' and A'immah

In order to clarify my point even further, whenever any nabī is sent then at first he alone is a believer; so now if he were to remain silent and conceal dīn then

the duty of imparting the message will remain unfulfilled, and it is an accepted fact that propagation of the message is incumbent upon the ambiyā’ and ʿulamā. The incumbency of propagating the message upon our Nabī ﷺ becomes apparent from the following verse:

يٰاَيُّهَا الرَّسُوْلُ بَلِّغْ مَاۤ اُنْزِلَ اِلَيْكَ مِنْ رَّبِّكَ ؕ وَ اِنْ لَّمْ تَفْعَلْ فَمَا بَلَّغْتَ رِسَالَتَهٗ ؕ

> O Rasūl ﷺ! Propagate what has been revealed to you from your Rabb. If you do not do so, then you have not conveyed Allah’s message.[1]

Similarly Allah Taʿālā says addressing the ummah:

وَلْتَكُنْ مِّنْكُمْ اُمَّةٌ يَّدْعُوْنَ اِلَى الْخَيْرِ وَيَاْمُرُوْنَ بِالْمَعْرُوْفِ وَيَنْهَوْنَ عَنِ الْمُنْكَرِ

> There should be a group from you who invite towards good, command what is right and forbid evil.[2]

It is obvious that those who know what is good and what is evil are the ʿulamā and the more knowledge one possesses the more incumbent it is upon him to propagate dīn. Who then is it most incumbent upon to propagate dīn if not the A’immah? If the ambiyā’ remained silent and never uttered a word about dīn then they would be sinners. However, if they propagated dīn then it is obvious that the message would not appeal to the inner self, which would result in some accepting and others rejecting. When something does not appeal to the inner self than you will only find one in every hundred thousand capable of being the same as Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه, accepting the truth immediately, while the majority will provide hundreds of excuses for rejecting and at times even become your enemy. If in such a time a nabī were to fear the reaction of people then what is the difference between a nabī and the lovers of worldly pursuit? If he were to shy away from his mission because of the objections of people then he will be dubbed a liar and even his supporters will distance themselves from him.

1 Sūrah al-Mā’idah: 67

2 Sūrah Āl Imrān: 104

However, if he remains firm and endures the attacks of people on his name, person and wealth then ease will soon follow. It is the promise of Allah that after difficulty and strife, ease always follows:

اَمْ حَسِبْتُمْ اَنْ تَدْخُلُوا الْجَنَّةَ وَ لَمَّا يَاْتِكُمْ مَّثَلُ الَّذِيْنَ خَلَوْا مِنْ قَبْلِكُمْ ؕ مَسَّتْهُمُ الْبَاْسَآءُ وَالضَّرَّآءُ وَ زُلْزِلُوْا حَتّٰى يَقُوْلَ الرَّسُوْلُ وَالَّذِيْنَ اٰمَنُوْا مَعَهٗ مَتٰى نَصْرُ اللّٰهِ ؕ اَلَآ اِنَّ نَصْرَ اللّٰهِ قَرِيْبٌ ﴿۲۱۴﴾

> Do you think that you will enter Jannah when there has not yet come to you the like of what came to the people before you? Suffering and hardship affected them and they were shaken until the Rasūl and those with him who had Imaan said, "When will the help of Allah come?" Surely, the help of Allah is near.[1]

When ease has come and the help of Allah descended then for what disease is taqiyyah a cure for? In essence there is no circumstance in which taqiyyah can be deemed permissible for the ambiyā' and since the A'immah are the deputies of Rasūlullāh ﷺ, and a deputy has the same task with which he has been deputised, the propagation of dīn is incumbent upon them also. In fact, it is not specifically incumbent upon them only but incumbent upon the entire ummah as well, as has just been mentioned above. However, they have been specifically appointed for this task and then too the A'immah are "infallible"; they cannot sin in any way, so it is impossible for them to practice taqiyyah just as it is impossible for the ambiyā'.

The Makkan period eliminates any possibility of taqiyyah

It is through the grace of Allah Taʿālā that after studying the lives of Rasūlullāh ﷺ and the other ambiyā', we learn that none of them ever shied away from speaking the truth and instead for the sake of the truth, were prepared to sacrifice their honour, standing, wealth and lives. The life of Rasūlullāh ﷺ is well-known, every Muslim must have heard of the courageous sacrifices he made for Islam. The persecution against Rasūlullāh ﷺ had reached such a level that he was boycotted, forced to live outside Makkah, with the kuffār making

1 Sūrah al-Baqarah: 214

a pact with each other not to have any financial or social relations with him and the Muslims. This also failed to silence Rasūlullāh ﷺ and finally they resolved to kill him, and he left secretly and migrated to Madīnah. If taqiyyah was permissible, leave alone compulsory, then why did he endure such difficulty? Why then did he leave the sacred city of Makkah, wherein the blessed Kaʿbah lies? Why were Abū Jahal and Abū Lahab his enemies? It is obvious that nothing besides his continuous zeal to announce the truth was what turned them against him. Rasūlullāh ﷺ had not snatched authority from their hands nor did he usurp their wealth. The same argument can be made in favour of Nabī Ibrāhīm عَلَيْهِ ٱلسَّلَامُ, why was he thrown into the fire, why was he forced to leave his home and migrate? Their only crime was adherence to the truth and continually calling towards it. It is clear as daylight; the ambiyā' never practised taqiyyah nor was it permissible for them to do so.

Likewise, their deputies too never practiced taqiyyah nor could they ever do so. The horrific event of Hussayn رَضِيَ ٱللَّٰهُ عَنْهُ and the terrible suffering he had to endure is well-known to all. The chief cause of this entire incident was his unflinching honesty and announcement of the truth. If it were any other way then he would have sworn himself to Yazīd whereby not only would his life have been spared but he would have been handsomely rewarded as well. The battle that ensued between Amīr al-Mu'minīn ʿAlī رَضِيَ ٱللَّٰهُ عَنْهُ and Muʿāwiyah رَضِيَ ٱللَّٰهُ عَنْهُ is known by all. Aside from this, the conditions of each of the A'immah must have been heard, how they were all assassinated or imprisoned by various emperors. If they had been practicing taqiyyah then why did they undergo all this suffering and torture?

In favour of an ordinary Muslim; it might be permissible if one has a legitimate excuse, but it will never be compulsory. For example, a young boy, woman, the blind, paralysed, a prisoner or any other person faced with no other alternative but to give in to the kuffār, may do so but on condition that there is fear of him losing a limb or loved one (perhaps the life of his son, mother, wife, etc is being threatened) but if there is only fear of a little pain which he is able to endure then it will not be permissible for him to concede to their demands.

The reward and encouragement of patience

All the same, true reward lies in not practicing taqiyyah because the numerous praises and virtues the Qur'ān mentions for those who adopt patience are for those who do so in adversity. If this praise were not for those patient in adversity then what adversity is there in taqiyyah that would warrant one to be patient. Taqiyyah does not lead to adversity, it brings comfort and fortune. This is the reason why the Qur'ān stresses most on adopting patience and no other quality has been emphasised in the same manner. Allah Taʿālā says:

وَالْعَصْرِ ﴿١﴾ اِنَّ الْاِنْسَانَ لَفِیْ خُسْرٍ ﴿٢﴾ اِلَّا الَّذِیْنَ اٰمَنُوْا وَ عَمِلُوا الصّٰلِحٰتِ وَ تَوَاصَوْا بِالْحَقِّ ۙ وَ تَوَاصَوْا بِالصَّبْرِ ﴿٣﴾

By the oath of time! Verily man is at a loss except those who have īmān, who do good deeds, who encourage each other towards the truth and who encourage each other to exercise patience.[1]

Where can truthfulness be found in the Shīʿah faith? Instead they encourage the concealment of the truth. Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه concealed one matter regarding Fadak (according to the Shīʿah paradigm) and he is cursed for eternity, so how cursed are those who conceal the entire truth, the entire dīn of Islam, how many thousand curses are upon them?

اِنَّ اللّٰهَ مَعَ الصّٰبِرِیْنَ

Verily Allah is with those who are patient.[2]

وَاللّٰهُ یُحِبُّ الصّٰبِرِیْنَ

Allah loves those who are patient.[3]

1 Sūrah al-ʿAsr

2 Sūrah al-Anfāl: 46

3 Sūrah Āl Imrān: 146

The Noble Qur'ān is filled with verses such as these; encouraging patience. If there were such a thing as taqiyyah then there would be no such thing as patience. In fact, the practice of taqiyyah has not been ordered anywhere in the Qur'ān. If it is allowed then it is only allowed for the common Muslims and then too for the weak amongst them, when their life is in danger, and it is not a blanket permissibility. In the same breath it should be stated that in such circumstances it is only permissible and not compulsory; in fact not practicing it would be more meritorious.

Migration is compulsory when practicing the truth is not possible

If one is truly faced with conditions under which taqiyyah is permissible then he should contemplate upon migrating and that too as soon as he is able to do so. He should migrate to such a place wherein nothing will prevent him from announcing the truth. The Qur'ān also has numerous verses emphasising the importance of migration:

اِنَّ اَرْضِىْ وَاسِعَةٌ فَاِيَّاىَ فَاعْبُدُوْنِ ﴿٥٦﴾

> Verily my earth is vast so worship Me only.[1]

In another verse, Allah says:

اِنَّ الَّذِيْنَ تَوَفّٰىهُمُ الْمَلٰٓئِكَةُ ظَالِمِىْٓ اَنْفُسِهِمْ قَالُوْا فِيْمَ كُنْتُمْ ؕ قَالُوْا كُنَّا مُسْتَضْعَفِيْنَ فِى الْاَرْضِ ؕ قَالُوْٓا اَلَمْ تَكُنْ اَرْضُ اللّٰهِ وَاسِعَةً فَتُهَاجِرُوْا فِيْهَا ؕ فَاُولٰٓئِكَ مَاْوٰىهُمْ جَهَنَّمُ ؕ وَسَآءَتْ مَصِيْرًا ﴿٩٧﴾

> Indeed those whose lives the angels seize while they oppress themselves, they say to them: "What was your condition?" They reply: "We were oppressed on earth." The angels will say: "Was Allah's land not vast enough for you to make hijrah in?" The abode of such folk is Jahannam, and it is the worst of destinations.[2]

1 Sūrah al-ʿAnkabūt: 56

2 Sūrah al-Nisā': 97

Aside from the above, there are even more verses containing the instruction to perform hijrah and the underlying reason for it, is that one is unable to propagate the laws of sharīʿah. In summary, taqiyyah under these conditions will be permissible, not compulsory, and it is incumbent upon them to then migrate to a land wherein they will be able to propagate the truth.

Propagating the truth is best, even when in danger

It is mentioned in the Qur’ān:

لَا يَتَّخِذِ الْمُؤْمِنُوْنَ الْكٰفِرِيْنَ اَوْلِيَآءَ مِنْ دُوْنِ الْمُؤْمِنِيْنَ ۚ وَمَنْ يَّفْعَلْ ذٰلِكَ فَلَيْسَ مِنَ اللّٰهِ فِيْ شَيْءٍ اِلَّآ اَنْ تَتَّقُوْا مِنْهُمْ تُقٰىةً وَ يُحَذِّرُكُمُ اللّٰهُ نَفْسَهٗ ؕ وَ اِلَى اللّٰهِ الْمَصِيْرُ ﴿٢٨﴾

> The mu’minīn should not take the disbelievers as close friends instead of the believers. Whoever does so has no connection with Allah; unless you need to safeguard yourselves from them. Allah warns you of Himself and to Allah is the return.[1]

This verse only permits one to save himself, in no way does it permit one to conform entirely to the kuffār and keep them as one’s dear friends. One is also able to save himself by migrating from that place.

Allah Taʿālā has stressed on the point that one should fear Him as it is to Him that you are to return. What do you fear the kuffār for, you should conform to them entirely only if your final return were to them. It is a different matter if a person is captured by them, imprisoned or suffers from some disability or the other, or is a woman or child and the kuffār force him to conform to their beliefs. This too only if he is threatened with such a torture which he will be unable to bear; he may be killed or a limb severed, in this case he has the choice to concede to their demands. However, reward will still be in him adhering to his beliefs and not conceding to the demands of the kuffār. The clause in the verse:

1 Sūrah Āl Imrān: 28

إِلَّا مَنْ أُكْرِهَ وَ قَلْبُهُ مُطْمَئِنٌّ بِالْإِيْمَانِ

> Except for the person who is forced (to make statements of kufr for fear of losing his life) but his heart is content with īmān.[1]

Informs us that one is only permitted to outwardly conform to their demands under duress. However, those verses which enumerate the virtues of those who are slain in the path of Allah inform us that true reward lies in proclaiming the truth, even if one's life may be threatened.

Nabī Ibrāhīm عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ never concealed any aspect of dīn

If any person were to then mention the 'untruths' told by Nabī Ibrāhīm عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ in support of his claim for the permissibility of taqiyyah then this will be a grave injustice. It might have appeared to be untrue but in reality it was not, which will become apparent from his story.

When Nabī Ibrāhīm عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ began calling towards tauḥīd and preventing his people from idol worship then amongst the first people to oppose him was his own father, who even threatened him. Nabī Ibrāhīm عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ was contemplating over how he could somehow destroy their idols when it just so happened that their day of ʿĪd arrived and they came to invite Nabī Ibrāhīm عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ also to join in the festivities. He then looked towards the heavens and said: "I am going to be ill." The kuffār thought that just as they believed in the stars so too did Nabī Ibrāhīm عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ believe in them and that if he participated in the festivities, he would fall ill. It should be noted that all he said was that, I am going to be ill or the signs of illness are setting in and he never said: "I have studied the stars and have discovered that I am going to be ill.", which would have been a lie. It was the kuffār who assumed that he determined this by studying the stars.

Once they had left, he proceeded to destroy all of their idols, leaving only the biggest of them untouched. When the kuffār saw what had happened to their

1 Sūrah al-Naḥl:106

idols, they had him brought forward, since he was the only one they knew who had denounced idol worship before. When asked if he had did it, he mockingly replied: "This big idol was the one who did it." This is the second lie he is accused of. No sane person will consider this to be a lie but in our vernacular it will be considered to be a truth. How are these two 'lies' equal to concealing the truth. In fact, the greatest proof that these statements are the opposite and rather proclaiming the truth is that he was thrown into the fire on account of them and more so on account of him saying: "The big one did it." This is definitely no lie but rather it exposes the truth more than concealing it. Everybody knows that this was not said with the intention of lying but was the plan of Nabī Ibrāhīm عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ to make them see the error of their ways, because then why did they become angry at him? Concealing the truth is indeed far-fetched. Furthermore, the answers that he gave to the king thereafter; there are very few who can do so in such a circumstance.

His claim of being ill that was first made, he did not make out of fear for his life nor was it out of fear for his wealth or honour but to fulfil a deep desire in his heart. It was only said so that they would leave and he could destroy their idols, which in itself would endanger his life. It can also be that he wished to save himself from participating in the customs, practices and worship of the kuffār. So in reality these statements were made in the spirit of sacrifice and only that person will claim that spirit of sacrifice and taqiyyah are one and the same, who cannot distinguish between a tail and a nose.

Concealing one's marital status does not equal to the concealment of dīn

As for the third 'untruth', Nabī Ibrāhīm عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ was migrating with his wife, Sārah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا, when they passed a city which was ruled by a tyrannical and immoral king. A solider of the army had informed the king of the immense beauty of Sārah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا and as a result he summoned them to his court. Nabī Ibrāhīm عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ understood that he must have heard about Sārah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا and in his lust, if he were to hear that I am her husband, he will surely kill me. As a result he instructed Sārah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا that if the king asks about their relationship then she should inform him that she

is his sister since they are brother and sister in dīn and Nabī Ibrāhīm عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ and Sārah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا were indeed cousins, she being the daughter of his maternal uncle. Thus in reality this was no lie and even if we were to hypothetically accept that it was then too this was not concealing dīn in anyway. If anything was concealed then it was their relationship of marriage and then too only to protect that life meant for the propagation of truth from being taken for such a trivial matter. In summary, the purpose of saving his own life was so that he could propagate the truth tomorrow and not sacrifice his life for something so trivial. In conclusion, to substantiate the legitimacy of taqiyyah from the life of Nabī Ibrāhīm عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ is a sign of poor understanding and perception.

In the precise manner, the hijrah of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, taking refuge in the Cave of Thowr, etc were all for the purpose of proclaiming the truth since there was nothing to prevent Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ from conceding to the demands of the kuffār and the need for Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ to practice taqiyyah at that juncture was definitely greater. Also under the categories of such taqiyyah will be warding off a blow from an enemy sword with your shield and if defending yourself is defined as taqiyyah then most definitely this will be on account of announcing the truth (and not concealing it), since one will only be required to defend himself when another intends to harm you.

The difference between defending yourself and taqiyyah

All must have understood by now the difference between defending yourself and taqiyyah but I wish to elaborate on this further. According to the Shīʿah, taqiyyah is employed to remove the intention to cause you harm from the heart of the enemy which is achieved by distancing yourself from (i.e. concealing) your true beliefs and promoting the beliefs of the enemy. Thus, when one outwardly adopts the beliefs of the enemy (practices taqiyyah) the enemy no longer remains the enemy and in fact becomes a friend.

However, in the case of defending yourself, the enmity only increases and the fear of harm becomes even greater because it is the rule of man that as long as

one has his enemy under his control and able to harm him whenever he desires, then he does not fear him. He remains unconcerned about him as he can harm or disgrace him whenever he pleases. However, when a person defends himself then the fear of retaliation arises, which increases the enmity. In such an event the enemy will pull out all the stops in defending itself and this is when those closest to Allah have to endure the greatest difficulty. Keep this difference in mind, it will prove beneficial later.

According to the Shīʿah, ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ failed to follow the Sunnah of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, Nabī Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ and Nabī Ibrāhīm عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ

When this has been established, then those who have any sense of impartiality should compare the circumstances which Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ faced in Makkah and on his journey of hijrah with the situation ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ faced after the demise of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. Assuming that the Ṣaḥābah reneged, then in tracing the footsteps of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ ought to have dealt with them in the same manner that Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ dealt with Abū Jahal, Umayyah bin Khalaf and the rest of the kuffār. If he were to have done so then sooner or later he would have faced the tribulations which Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ experienced, thereby compelling him to undertake the only alternative of hijrah, which was the course Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, Nabī Ibrāhīm عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ and Nabī Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ ultimately took.

However, it is rather strange that he never once expressed to the Ṣaḥābah that he alone was upon truth and they were upon falsehood. Assuming that he had expressed this, there could have been one of two outcomes. The Ṣaḥābah would have attested to the veracity of his claim, in which case there would remain no need for taqiyyah and there would be no objection against ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. In fact, this would have been exactly what ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ would have desired, or they would have rejected his claim. If this were a possibility then why is it that they did not harm such an enemy or persecute him thereafter?

If it is said that despite opposing them, ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ remained unharmed on account of his valour and courage or due to the divine aid of Allah then this is absurd

because it implies that Rasūlullāh ﷺ is lesser than ʿAlī رضي الله عنه. Why then was Rasūlullāh ﷺ not spared from the persecution of his enemies?

It is thus established that the claim of taqiyyah against ʿAlī رضي الله عنه is indeed false. If he were to have resorted to taqiyyah, then he should have resorted to it in Makkah Mukarramah. If not there then it was more appropriate to exercise taqiyyah with Muʿāwiyah رضي الله عنه. If he had resorted to taqiyyah with Muʿāwiyah رضي الله عنه then the worst that could have happened was that the murderers of ʿUthmān رضي الله عنه would have been executed. After all, they held no position of importance to ʿAlī رضي الله عنه, which justifies the great dissension the ummah was subjected to on account of not handing them over.

In contrast to this, whilst ʿAlī رضي الله عنه 'spared' the killers of ʿUthmān رضي الله عنه, Ḥusayn رضي الله عنه sacrificed his own life and that of his innocent family members. His mission apparently seemed to be futile and more of a suicide operation, considering his insignificant, ill-equipped band of followers against a formidable army of thirty-thousand men.

If ʿAlī رضي الله عنه had handed over the murderers of ʿUthmān رضي الله عنه to Muʿāwiyah رضي الله عنه, his khilāfah and authority would have been established indisputably, a 'rebel' and 'mischief-monger' would have been subdued and dīn would have flourished. In addition to this, handing over the killers would have been totally justified as they were villains, not innocent victims like the companions of Ḥusayn رضي الله عنه.

The reality is that it is the Shīʿah who have actually levelled the accusation of concealing the truth against ʿAlī رضي الله عنه and it is they who have labelled him as a coward.

سبحانك هذا بهتان عظيم

You are indeed pure, this is but greave slander.

Taqiyyah was obligatory upon ʿAlī رضي الله عنه during his reign as khalīfah

The absurdity of the Shīʿī doctrine of taqiyyah does not end here. Consequently, Sharīf al-Murtaḍā, who is one of their acclaimed scholars, maintains that taqiyyah was incumbent upon ʿAlī رضي الله عنه even whilst he held the highest position of authority as the khalīfah. Will this confounded taqiyyah ever leave ʿAlī رضي الله عنه in peace?

If we were to ask, why then did ʿAlī رضي الله عنه dismiss Muʿāwiyah رضي الله عنه if taqiyyah was incumbent on him, especially when ʿAlī رضي الله عنه considered him a potential threat and even expressed that his plotting was destructive. In addition to this, he was advised by Ibn ʿAbbās رضي الله عنه and Mughīrah ibn Shuʿbah رضي الله عنه to postpone the dismissal until his authority was established. However, he did not heed their advice and this led to such repercussions, the details of which is documented in Shīʿī sources as well.

Now reflect on the argument and evidence of Sharīf al-Murtaḍā. He says that ʿAlī's رضي الله عنه position as the khalīfah was fictitious since Muʿāwiyah رضي الله عنه was constantly at loggerheads with him. Similarly, his army and most of his close associates were the offspring of the Ṣaḥābah, who were actually his staunch enemies, and all of his men attested to the merit and legitimacy of the reign of the first and second khulafā. If ʿAlī رضي الله عنه were to have expressed the truth under such overwhelming circumstances, he would have suffered an irretrievable loss and he would lose the loyalty of his entire force. It is for this reason that proclaiming the truth was prohibited and it was incumbent upon him to resort to taqiyyah even whilst holding the position of khalīfah.

For the record it must be stated that Sharīf al-Murtaḍā has differed with the view of the mainstream Shīʿah, who maintain that taqiyyah was only incumbent upon him before assuming the position of khalīfah and it was prohibited thereafter. However, Sharīf al-Murtaḍā thought that his stance was more prudent and effective, but his plot has worked against him.

Assessing the allegation of resorting to taqiyyah during his reign as the khalīfah

Sharīf al-Murtaḍā pre-empted the possibility of some Sunnī analysing the sermons and discourses of ʿAlī رضي الله عنه which he delivered during his khilāfah and perhaps stumble upon his glowing tribute to the Ṣaḥābah in general and the first two khulafā specifically. Or that a Sunnī may question why ʿAlī رضي الله عنه failed to promote the Shīʿī creed during his reign, just as Abū Bakr and ʿUmar رضي الله عنهما "concealed" the original teachings and promoted their "fabricated religion" in their appointed terms. Similarly, his position as the fourth khalīfah was more opportune for him to promote the correct dīn as opposed to the sequence of khilāfah being reversed. Notwithstanding this, why is it that the creed of the Ahl al-Sunnah wa l-Jamā'ah prevailed?

The only logical answer to this would be that ʿAlī رضي الله عنه favoured the creed of the Ahl al-Sunnah. It is because of these damning possibilities that Sharīf al-Murtaḍā took the stance that he took on taqiyyah.

ʿAlī رضي الله عنه failed to promote dīn despite having supernatural abilities

If ʿAlī's رضي الله عنه position as the khalīfah was superficial; did it not occur to him that khilāfah or wilāyah refers to nothing more than holding authority to pass decrees in the land under one's governance, being able to collect taxes and revenue and having the force with which to deal with criminals and bandits. With the exception of Syria, in which other domain of Muslim lands did ʿAlī رضي الله عنه not enjoy such authority? There can be no two opinions about his consolidated authority over Ḥijāz, Oman, Makkah, Madīnah, Bahrain, Iraq, Azerbaijan, Persia and Khurāsān. Is this not sufficient authority and influence in contrast to the hold of Muʿāwiyah رضي الله عنه over Syria? ʿAlī رضي الله عنه was surely in a position to pass any decree.

Bear in mind that the tiny Arabian Peninsula which Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه assumed authority over after the demise of Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم was afflicted with multiple challenges; whilst Musaylamah and the Banū Yamāmah rebelled on one front,

Sajāh claimed nubuwwah and with the support of the entire Banū Tamīm, which was the largest of the Arab tribes. The rejecters of zakāh and the multitudes of renegades were a separate challenge along with the Banū Usfān and other tribes who disputed the political authority of Madīnah. Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه was left with a small group of loyal Muslims only in Makkah and Madīnah, but they did not surrender in the least nor did they compromise. They certainly could have appeased all their foes as easily as they could have appeased those who refused to submit zakāh.

Abū Bakr al-Ṣiddīq رضي الله عنه defended the truth all by himself

Despite the lack of resources and the comparative 'lack of bravery', Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه was not alarmed by the overwhelming threat, despite most of his opponents being skilled at warfare and some of them even ruling over little kingdoms as well. Notwithstanding the fact that Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه lacked the attributes which ʿAlī رضي الله عنه possessed (ʿAlī رضي الله عنه is characterised to have unparalleled bravery, the ability to display unique miraculous feats, the one legitimately entitled as the walī and the khalīfah, etc), Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه still achieved what he achieved, why is it that ʿAlī رضي الله عنه was unable to accomplish his mission and proclaim the truth? If Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه had these attributes of ʿAlī رضي الله عنه then there would have been no chance of any non-believer ever surviving in the world. We make this claim and we would take full responsibility for it, if he would achieve anything less than that.

As for saying that the majority of ʿAlī's رضي الله عنه army consisted of the offspring of Ṣaḥābah, this is a statement that would have sounded better if uttered by a Sunnī. What grounds does Sharīf al-Murtaḍā have for making such a statement? Has he not heard the statement of Qādhī Nūr Allāh, who said that ʿAlī رضي الله عنه could not prevail because he only had the support of five individuals from the Quraysh, whilst the rest of the thirteen tribes stood with Muʿāwiyah رضي الله عنه?

In addition to this, the Shīʿah claim that the companions of ʿAlī رضي الله عنه were actually the die-hard Kufis. However, if his army only comprised of the offspring of the

Ṣaḥābah, then just as they believed in the merit and legitimacy of the first two khulafā and approved of their khilāfah, they were also fully acquainted with the teachings of Rasūlullāh ﷺ, which was transmitted to them by their parents.

Also assuming that they would have forsaken ʿAlī رضي الله عنه if he were to have proclaimed the truth, his cause would not have suffered any setbacks at all. After all, there are such temptations within the 'Dīn of ʿAlī' which would make just about every sceptic succumb. If the supporters of Muʿāwiyah رضي الله عنه would have heard of the legitimacy of *mutā* (temporary marriage) they would have surely abandoned him. In fact, any person who devoutly subscribed to any religion would have been lured by the temptation of mutā; which legalises promiscuity in this world and secures the ultimate ranks of the hereafter. No matter how staunch anyone may have been upon his religion, the call to mutā was sure to make them deflect and unite under the standard of ʿAlī رضي الله عنه. Furthermore, the concession of not washing one's feet in wuḍu and being relieved of tarāwīḥ ṣalāh add to the temptation. Such a religion and such faith could only be the fortune of very lucky people. If ʿAlī رضي الله عنه would have proclaimed the truth then the entire Arab and non-Arab populace would have responded.

Allah is pure! Such a flimsy premise and yet they have the audacity to challenge the Ahl al-Sunnah? They should have at least realised that from beginning to end, the loyal supporters of Rasūlullāh ﷺ were those who were either brothers, relatives or children of people who were his sworn enemies, consider Khālid bin Walīd رضي الله عنه and ʿIkramah bin Abī Jahal رضي الله عنه. In fact, ʿUmar رضي الله عنه was also the nephew of Abū Jahal and Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه was the son of Abū Quhāfah. As for ʿUthmān رضي الله عنه, he was the close relative of Abū Sufyān, and this was the case for the majority of the Ṣaḥābah.

When these ties of kinship did not pose a deterrent for them standing up to the truth, nothing else could possibly have deterred them from supporting the truth or defending it.

Proclaiming the truth and suffering the consequences has always been the hallmark of the chosen servants of Allah

Let us conclude this discussion on taqiyyah by citing two verses of the Noble Qur'ān, which proves that the chosen servants of Allah have always suffered persecution at the hands of the enemies of Allah. Let it be known thereby that Allah loves steadfastness and endurance for the sake of dīn, not complacency and compromise. Allah Taʿālā says:

> إِنَّ الَّذِيْنَ يَكْفُرُوْنَ بِاٰيٰتِ اللّٰهِ وَيَقْتُلُوْنَ النَّبِيّٖنَ بِغَيْرِ حَقٍّ ۙ وَّيَقْتُلُوْنَ الَّذِيْنَ يَاْمُرُوْنَ بِالْقِسْطِ مِنَ النَّاسِ ۙ فَبَشِّرْهُمْ بِعَذَابٍ اَلِيْمٍ ﴿٢١﴾
>
> Surely those who disbelieve in the āyāt of Allah and who unjustly slay the ambiyā' and slay those from mankind who command justice, give them the good news of a most painful punishment.[1]

Allah warns those who took the lives of the ambiyā' and the lives of those who proclaimed the truth of a painful torment. This verse establishes that the ambiyā' of Allah and the righteous ones never resort to taqiyyah.

Ponder over the following verse as well:

> يٰۤاَيُّهَا الَّذِيْنَ اٰمَنُوْا مَنْ يَّرْتَدَّ مِنْكُمْ عَنْ دِيْنِهٖ فَسَوْفَ يَاْتِي اللّٰهُ بِقَوْمٍ يُّحِبُّهُمْ وَيُحِبُّوْنَهٗۤ ۙ اَذِلَّةٍ عَلَى الْمُؤْمِنِيْنَ اَعِزَّةٍ عَلَى الْكٰفِرِيْنَ ۫ يُجَاهِدُوْنَ فِيْ سَبِيْلِ اللّٰهِ وَلَا يَخَافُوْنَ لَوْمَةَ لَآئِمٍ ۭ ذٰلِكَ فَضْلُ اللّٰهِ يُؤْتِيْهِ مَنْ يَّشَآءُ ۭ وَاللّٰهُ وَاسِعٌ عَلِيْمٌ ﴿٥٤﴾
>
> O you who have īmān! Whoever among you turns away from his religion, then Allah can soon bring another nation whom He loves and who love Him; who will be kind towards the mu'minīn, stern towards the kuffār and who will strive in Allah's way (to uplift Islam) without fearing the criticism

1 Sūrah Āl Imrān: 21

> of those who criticise. This is the grace of Allah that He grants to whoever He desires. Allah is All Surrounding, All Knowing.[1]

This verse establishes that the beloved ones, who truly love Allah, are never suppressed by the disbelievers nor do they behave complacently towards them. Instead they confront them, oppose them and fear no rebuke. Is taqiyyah not the exact opposite of this? If so, then taqiyyah certainly is not the hallmark of the chosen ones of Allah. Rather, it is the trait of the enemies of Allah and His messenger.

Judging taqiyyah by social standards

The discussion thus far exposed the fallacy of taqiyyah in the light of sound reasoning and narration. It would now be appropriate to test its merit by social norms and standards so that its absurdity may be fully exposed.

Society has always acknowledged and lauded resoluteness and steadfastness and people look upon double-standards and hypocrisy with scorn and disdain, especially in matters pertaining to religion. If the ambiyā’ of Allah and those charged with the responsibility of proclaiming the truth were to have expressed the truth once only and thereafter compromised with the disbelievers for fear of losing their lives or dignity, then everyone would accuse them of having some worldly motive. As a result, the object of displaying miracles would be defeated, and those who had any inclination to the truth would be disheartened, those upon guidance would lose faith after concluding that the ultimate objective of these ambiyā’ was but a quest for name and fame.

It is a well-known fact that the effectiveness of any person’s admonition and advice depends on his practical conformance to it. If taqiyyah is valid then there is no question of being a practical example of what one is preaching. The doors to guidance would be sealed.

1 Sūrah al-Mā’idah: 54

Therefore, the fallacy of taqiyyah is established through logic, narration and even social standards. Yet you will find those, whose vision is distorted, failing to see the truth no matter how clear it may be. Furthermore, it is reported in a ḥadīth that "Love for something makes one blind and deaf." If they were to distance the love of the Shīʿī faith from their hearts for just a moment and thereafter analyse the discussions for and against taqiyyah, then (Allah willing) even ʿAmmār ʿAlī will be compelled to repent and forget all about converting Nadir ʿAlī to Shī'asm.

Whilst there is no need for further elaboration on taqiyyah let us pose the following question to the Shīʿī scholars thereby completing the argument against them. Let us assume, despite it being impossible, that taqiyyah is valid, then when the majority of Siḥāḥ scholars maintain that taqiyyah was prohibited during the reign of ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, how can ʿAlī's رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ praise of the Ṣaḥābah still be classified as taqiyyah?

Imām al-Bāqir curses those who refute the title of al-Ṣiddīq

If we were to accept the view of those who maintain that taqiyyah was incumbent upon ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ even during his reign as the khalīfah, then despite this being preposterous and baseless by all standards, we would ask why did Imām al-Bāqir رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّٰهُ praise Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, when the Shīʿah maintain that Imām al-Bāqir رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّٰهُ was prohibited by Allah from resorting to taqiyyah? This prohibition of taqiyyah for Imām al-Bāqir رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّٰهُ is recorded by ʿAlī ibn Īsā and by al-Ardabīlī in his book *Kashf al-Ghummah ʿan Maʿrifah al-A'immah*. The text is as follows:

> سئل الإمام أبو جعفر عن حلية السيف ، هل يجوز؟ فقال : نعم ، قد حلى أبو بكر الصديق سيفه. فقال الراوي ، القول هكذا؟ فوثب الإمام عن مكانه فقال : نعم الصديق ، نعم الصديق ، نعم الصديق – فمن لم يقل له الصديق فلا صدق الله قوله في الدنيا والآخرة

> Imām Abū Jaʿfar (Muḥammad al-Bāqir رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّٰهُ) was asked about the permissibility of decorating the handle of the sword with gold or silver. He replied that it was permissible and as proof cited that the sword of Abū Bakr al-Ṣiddīq رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was embellished with silver. The person who posed the

question then asked him if he referred to Abū Bakr ﵁ as "Al-Ṣiddīq", whereupon he became angry, rose from his place and stated three times that Abū Bakr ﵁ certainly is "Al-Ṣiddīq", and whoever disputes this then may Allah never let his word be true in this world or in the hereafter.

Let it be known that the Shīʿah are unanimous about the scholarship and credibility of ʿAlī ibn Īsā and al-Ardabīlī and that their transmissions are beyond any doubt.

Why was taqiyyah ḥarām for Imām al-Bāqir?

If one were to ask why Imām al-Baqir رحمه الله was not permitted to resort to taqiyyah then the following narration of al-Kulaynī should clarify the issue:

عن معاذ بن كثير عن ابي عبد الله قال : إن الله عز وجلّ أنزل على نبيه كتابا فقال : يا محمد ؛ هذه وصيتك إلى النجباء ، فقال : ومن النجباء يا جبريل؟ فقال : علي بن أبي طالب وولده. كان على الكتاب خواتيم من ذهب ، فدفعه رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم إلى علي وأمره أن يفكّ خاتما منه فيعمل بما فيه. ثم دفعه إلى الحسن ففكّ عنه خاتماً فعمل بما فيه ، ثم دفعه إلى الحسين ففكّ خاتما ، فوجد فيه : أخرج بقوم إلى الشهادة فلا شهادة لهم إلا معك واشتر نفسك لله ، ففعل. ثم دفعه إلى علي بن الحسين ففكّ خاتما فوجد فيه: أن أطرق واصمت وألزم منزلك واعبد ربك حتي يأتيك اليقين ، ففعل. ثم دفعه إلى إبنه محمد بن علي بن الحسين عليه السلام ، ففكّ خاتما فوجد فيه : حدّث الناس وأفتهم وانشر علوم أهل بيتك وصدّق آباءك الصالحين ، ولا تخافنّ أحداً إلا الله ، فإنه لا سبيل لأحد عليك. ثم دفعه إلى جعفر الصادق ففكّ خاتما ، فوجد فيه : حدّث الناس وأفتهم وانشر علوم أهل بيتك وصدّق آباءك الصالحين ، فإنك في حرز وأمان. ففعل. ثم دفعه إلى إبنه موسى عليه السلام وهكذا إلى قيام المهدي – ورواه من طريق آخر عن معاذ بن كثير أيضاً عن أبي عبد الله وفيه : في الخاتم الخامس : وقل الحق في الأمن والخوف ولا تخش إلا الله ؛ إهـ

The summary of this narration is as follows:

Al-Kulaynī transmits from Muʿādh ibn Kathīr, who reports from Imām Muḥammad al-Bāqir that Allah Taʿālā revealed a document to Rasūlullāh ﷺ and told him that this document contained his *wasiyyah* (bequest) to the "Nujabā". When he asked Jibra'īl عليه السلام who was referred to by "Nujabā", he replied that it referred to ʿAlī ﵁ and his offspring. This document

had many golden seals. Rasūlullāh ﷺ thus handed the document to ʿAlī رضي الله عنه and instructed him to break one seal and act upon the directive contained therein. ʿAlī رضي الله عنه then handed the document to Ḥasan رضي الله عنه. He also broke a seal and acted upon the directive. He then gave the document to Ḥusayn رضي الله عنه. He broke a seal and found the following directive:

> Set forth towards martyrdom with a group of people who will not attain martyrdom except with you. Sell yourself to Allah.

He thus carried out the injunction. He then handed the document over to Zayn al-Ābidīn رحمه الله. He broke a seal and found the following directive:

> Sit with your head lowered, remain silent and be confined to your home, worshipping Allah till you meet your end.

He did as instructed and then handed over the document to his son, Muḥammad al-Bāqir رحمه الله. He broke a seal and found the following directive:

> Transmit ḥadīth to the people and issue fatāwā, propagate the knowledge of the Ahl al-Bayt and be faithful to your righteous ancestors. Do not fear anyone in the matter of Allah, for none will be able to harm you.

He acted upon this and then handed the document to his son, Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq رحمه الله. He broke a seal and found the following directive:

> Transmit ḥadīth to the people and issue fatāwā, propagate the knowledge of the Ahl al-Bayt and be faithful to your righteous ancestors. You are certainly under divine protection.

He did as instructed and then passed the document over to his son, Mūsā رحمه الله. In this manner the document will eventually be passed over to Imām al-Mahdī.

Al-Kulaynī transmits another version of this narration on the authority of Mūsā ibn Kathīr. This version states that upon breaking the fifth seal (the seal of Imām Muḥammad al-Bāqir رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّهُ) there was the following addition:

> And proclaim the truth in safety and in fear, and do not fear anyone except Allah.

Ponder over the words of this narration and see the emphatic prohibition of taqiyyah for Imām Muḥammad al-Bāqir رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّهُ. He was instructed to proclaim the truth in safety and in fear and yet he awards the highest honour to Abū Bakr رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ by referring to him as al-Ṣiddīq, which is the station after nubuwwah. He then goes on to curse all those who do not accept that Abū Bakr رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ holds the title of al-Ṣiddīq.

The curse of Imām al-Bāqir proves the legitimacy of the Ahl al-Sunnah

As much as this narration establishes the highest title for Abū Bakr al-Ṣiddīq رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ, it conclusively determines that the Ahl al-Sunnah are upon the truth and the Shīʿah are deviated. It does so in the following manner...

Firstly, this narration subjects all variants of Shīʿī doctrine; Imāmīyyah or otherwise, to the curse of the 'infallible' Imām whose prayers are undoubtedly accepted. Forget, the Ahl al-Sunnah, even the Shīʿah would have no reservations about the validity of this curse. Based on this, it becomes absolutely certain that their claim of love for the Ahl al-Bayt, or their claim of being Muslims and people of faith is false in the sight of Allah and Allah Taʿālā will reject their claims in the hereafter too.

Secondly, (since he was entrusted with directives in the document given to him) whatever ʿAlī رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُ did was in accordance with the command of Allah and the wasiyyah of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى ٱللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, and was not on the basis of taqiyyah. Therefore, since he pledged his allegiance to Abū Bakr, ʿUmar, and ʿUthmān رَضِيَ ٱللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ, it establishes their legitimacy to the post of khalīfah. Similarly, the marriage of

his daughter, Ummī Kulthum to ʿUmar رضي الله عنها was no less than divine instruction just as the marriage of Fāṭimah to ʿAlī رضي الله عنهما. So praise be to Allah that the truth has been established and falsehood has been exposed and the Shīʿah are left dumbfounded. All praise belongs to Allah.

An objection against Imām Jaʿfar رحمه الله by the Shīʿah themselves

In a final attempt (and purely for the sake of argument) the Shīʿah could turn around and say that it certainly seems that the Book of Allah and the sayings of the A'immah of the Ahl al-Bayt are two credible testimonies proving that the Ahl al-Sunnah are upon truth and that the Shīʿah are upon falsehood. The fact that these are credible testimonies are borne out by the following ḥadīth which is considered to be an authentic ḥadīth according to both the Ahl al-Sunnah and Shīʿī scholars:

> إنى تارِك فيكم ما إن تمسكتم به لن تضلوا بعدى أحدهما أعظم من الآخر كتاب الله حبل ممدود من السماء إلى الأَرض وعترتى أهل بيتى ولن يتفرقا
>
> I am leaving behind two weighty things after me; you will not deviate as long as you hold on to them. One of them has greater status than the other; the Book of Allah, a continuous rope (of Allah) from the heavens unto the earth and my family members. They will never part with each other.

However, after one accepts that these are two credible testimonies then the Shīʿī assertions, which they base upon what has been narrated to them from their 'infallible' A'immah, entitles them to the curse of Imām al-Bāqir since rejection of the title of al-Ṣiddīq is unanimously agreed upon by all their leaders. Therefore, rejecting this position of Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه discredits all of them as Imām al-Bāqir رحمه الله said that their speech should not be accepted if they reject the position of Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه (the rejection of Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه discredits all of them).

In addition to this, (if the Shīʿah were to say that) most of our prominent leaders and credible transmitters were disbelievers and infidels and they have been

classified as such by Shīʿī standards. Consequently, the situation of some of their prominent figures has been dealt with under the discussion of the verse of Sūrah al-Fatḥ. As for the rest of them, it is best that their condition be left vague. As for Zurārah ibn Aʿyun, Imām Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq رَحِمَهُ ٱللَّهُ has declared him to be an inmate of Jahannam, and this is recorded in their authentic references on the authority of Ibn Sammān.

Qādhī Nūr Allāh says that Zurārah's four brothers - Hamrān, ʿAbd al-Malik, Bukhayr and ʿAbd al-Rahmān - as well as his sons - Ḥasan and Ḥusayn - his nephews - Ḥamzah, Muḥammad, Khuraysh, ʿAbd Allāh, Jaḥm, ʿAbd al-Majīd, ʿAbd al-Aʿlā and ʿUmar; all shared the same views as Zurārah. Therefore, all of them maintained the view that Allah Taʿālā was ignorant at some point in the past, Allah forbid. As a result of this belief, they disbelieve in the following verse of the Noble Qur'ān:

وَكُنَّا بِكُلِّ شَيْءٍ عٰلِمِيْنَ

> We have knowledge of all things.[1]

The verdict regarding one who rejects a single verse of the Qur'an or even less is abundantly clear.

(So if the Shīʿah were to say that) When this is the condition of our prominent figures, what could be said about the multitude of weak narrators and those who are clouded in obscurity? Therefore, we cannot accept their transmissions (from the A'immah of the Ahl al-Bayt at all), which leaves the Ahl al-Sunnah with only one credible witness instead of the required two. This credible witness is the Noble Qur'ān, which has been profusely transmitted throughout the generations by the highest standards of transmission. As for the testimony of the Ahl al-Bayt, it could only be accepted if it matches the transmission by which the Qur'ān has been transmitted. This fundamentally requires every link in the chain to be a

1 Sūrah al-Ambiyā': 81

Muslim who is upright and credible and since all our narrators are either infidels or obscure, we have no conviction on any of their narrations. Since you have only one credible testimony we are compelled to reject the honourable status of the Ṣaḥābah, even though we had to absolve ourselves of any affiliation to our faith and expose the true identity of our scholars in the process.

There are many responses to this type of rationale but for now we would rather rest our case, as you were compelled to actually uproot the foundation of your entire faith.

Nevertheless, for our own purposes we have established through the Noble Qur'ān and the testimony of the Ahl al-Bayt (i.e. the Thaqalayn) that the Shīʿah faith is baseless and this is all we wanted to achieve. It now seems appropriate to refer to the letter of ʿAmmār ʿAlī and we will record it hereunder verbatim so that the reader may fully appreciate the worth of our response to it.

Coming In part 2:

- Substantiated reply to ʿAmmâr ʿAlī
- The marriage of ʿUmar to Ummi Kulthūm bint ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمَا
- Proof that Nabī صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ had four daughters
- A comprehensive discussion on the garden of Fadak